A

VIEW

OF THE

TIMES,

THEIR

PRINCIPLES and PRACTICES

IN THE

REHEARSALS.

VOL. VI.

By *PHILALETHES.*

Qui bene latuit.——

The SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

Printed for W. BOWEN, near St. *Paul's.*

MDCCL.

THE REHEARSAL.

Wednesday, Jan. 5, 1708. No. 385.

1. It will be ill taken to *un-church* the *kirk*.
2. But it is necessary in *charity* to their *souls* and my own.
3. They undervalue our *baptisms* as much as we do theirs.
4. They *answer* (by their *Observator*) in setting up downright *persecution* against me.
5. The *episcopal* people in *Scotland* must come to *England* to have their children *baptized*. The example of *Tobit*.
6. They who have received *presbyterian baptism* there ought to seek the *episcopal*.
7. The hazard of going to *doubtful baptism*, where we may have what is *secure*.
8. How *solicitous* we are about the *title* of an *estate*, and how *indifferent* as to *heaven*.

1. *Coun.* OUR last discourse has made a great impression upon me. You have shewed me plainly that *baptism* is an *initiating* and *regenerating ordinance*; and that it is not now to be had in the *erastian kirk* of *Scotland* (*erastian* shall always be their *epithet* with me) nay, that their *baptisms* are worse than *none!*

that they are out of the *catholick church*, and so not to be reckoned as *Christians!* Bless me! you'll be called a very *hot* man, *high-church* indeed! they'll *curse* you by *bell, book and candle*.

2. *R.* If they *curse*, I'll *bless* them, by endeavouring to turn them from their *iniquity*. I'm sure I should have less *charity*, if I suffered them to go on in their *sins*, without telling them of it. I must *sow* on, though some fall upon *stones*, or among *thorns*. I hope there is some *good ground* among them, men who will overcome *prejudices* and consider; at least I have delivered my own *soul*. And they, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, shall know, that the *truth* has been told them, and that so evidently, as that they cannot answer or deny it.

3. And how can they call it *high flying* to say their *baptisms* are worse than *none*, when they say the same of our *private baptisms*, and declare it in their practice, suffering their own *children* to *die* without *baptism*, rather than give them *private baptism?* And how can they say that it is an *over-charge* upon them, that they think there is no *benefit* in *baptism*, when they will let their *children* die without it? Would they keep back from their expiring *infants* any thing they thought in the least *beneficial* towards their *salvation?* Would they be thought so *cruel* and *hard hearted* to their own *flesh* and *blood!*

C. It cannot be gainsaid, it is *apparent* and *notorious* to all the world! And *woe* be to them who, knowing this, would *sooth* them, or let them *sleep* on in their *sins*; and it must be hard *knocking*, and *shaking* them that will *awaken* them; though he that does it gets as little thanks as he who would *rouse* a *sluggard* out of a sweet *slumber*, tho' the *house* were on *fire* about him; but afterwards he will bless you, when he sees the *danger* he has escaped.

R. If I have raised their *indignation*, and if they are intended to do me any *mischief* (as I have been told) all I shall say to them is, that I had rather suffer *by* them than *for* them, in not *warning* them while there was space of *repentance*.

4. *C.*

4. *C.* You need not question their good will. The *Observator* has of a long time been hunting the *government* upon you. He says he has solicited the *lords* and *commons*, and the *Scotch members* in particular. And lastly, he has been stirring up the *grand juries* to make *presentments* against you.

R. That was only because he had the better of the *argument*, and to shew his *moderation!*

C. His own friends cry shame upon him for this; they say, is this like a *disputant?* they think it is giving up the *cause*, and looks *pitiful*.

5. *R.* When the *ten tribes* had *revolted*, and their new *king* had set up new *priests*, *Tobit* of the tribe of *Nephthali* went up every year to *Jerusalem* with his *first-fruits* and *tenths*, to keep the *feasts* and to *sacrifice* there, *Tob.* i. 4, 5, 6, 7. He did not plead the *legal establishment* as a justification of the new *priesthood*, or a discharge to him from his obligations to that *priesthood* which *God* had appointed. He thought it not in the *power* of the *king* and *people* with him to alter or change that *priesthood*, or to set up any *other*, or to alienate the *tenths* and *first-fruits*, but he paid them still to the true *priests* the *sons* of *Aaron*, though he then lived in another *kingdom*, and belonged to one of their *tribes*. Now *baptism* is of greater importance than the *legal institutions*: and from *Scotland* to *England* is as near a journey as from *Israel* to *Judah*. Therefore, if the *conscientious* in *Scotland* cannot have *clergy* who are *authorized* by *Christ* to *baptize* their *children*, they should imitate the piety of *Tobit*, and come into *England* for it. Though the hardship is very great to put *infants* to take such journeys at all seasons of the year, and all have not the convenience if they would; I pray God pity their case, and deliver us from the like. We deserve it; nor are we to think these *sinners* above all others in *Britain*; but, *except ye repent*——

6. *C.* But if any who have received *presbyterian baptism* in *Scotland*, should, upon examining the matter, find it to be *null* and *void*, what would you have them do?

R. If it were my case, I would be *baptized* by some of the *episcopal clergy*; I say not *re-baptized*, because I judge the former to be no *baptism* at all, as being done without any even *vertual* consent of the *bishop* that can possibly be supposed (as in the case of *lay-baptism*, where it is *allowed* or *connived* at in case of *necessity*, and in some foreign churches, where the like *necessity* is pleaded) but in direct *opposition* not only to their own *bishops*, but to all the *episcopal* authority in the whole *church* of *God*. A case not known in St. *Cyprian*'s time, and when the dispute of *re-baptization* was so warmly canvassed. No such sort of *schismaticks* from the *universal church* of *Christ* was then known in the world. And in cases of such *importance* it is surely best to take the *safest* side.

7. *C.* Would tender *parents*, who are so solicitous about the welfare of their *children*, consider seriously of this, they would not bring them to (at the best) doubted *baptism*; they would not run any *hazard* of their *souls*, but go where their *baptism* was *secure*, even by the confession of the *presbyterians* themselves, and so would be safe on all sides.

8. *R.* There is nothing wherein men are so *generous* as in venturing their *souls!* None would buy an *estate* of a doubtful *title* to please *friend* or *party*. We are careful how we lay out our *money*. We will see the *deeds* perfected, and examine strictly the *authority* of the *attorney* who *signs* them; we must see his *letter of attorney*, and that it be sufficiently *witnessed*. We take no body's word in such cases.

But as to our *eternal inheritance*, we believe every body that goes along the highway. If we like a man's *face*, or the *tune* of his *voice*, we adapt him of our own heads to be an *attorney* for *God*, to *sign* and *seal* his *covenant* with us. If we are *pleased*, we think *God* must be *pleased* too! and if any tell us that *God* has appointed an *order* of men for this purpose, and given them his *commission* and *authority* to *baptize* in his name, and promised to *ratify* in *heaven* what his *attornies* thus *impowered* by *him* shall, in his *name*, *sign* and *seal* upon *earth*;

earth; or else why did he appoint such an *order* of men, and give them such *powers*? We call all this, *stuff*! nay, but give me a *gifted* man of my own chusing! and we will venture the *souls* of our poor *infants*, and our own too! are they not our own!

Saturday, January 8, 1708. N° 386.

---

1. The *bishops* are made *keepers* of the *seal* of *baptism*, as the lord *chancellor* of the *king*'s great seal.
2. Better trust to the *mercy* of *God* without the *seal*, than to *counterfeit* it, or *steal* it from the proper *officers*.
3. We are strictly *tied* to the *rules*, but *God* is not.
4. Some are *prejudiced* against *baptism* because of the *easiness* and seeming *weakness* of the *means*. The case of *Naaman*.
5. *Prayer* will not prevail without the outward *ordinance*, where it may be had, nor the greatest *sanctity* excuse from it. Our 27th *article* justifies the *comparison* I have made of the *great seal*.
6. Why the *presbyterians* have so much depretiated *baptism*.
7. The great stress the *apostles* laid upon it, as the only ordinary *means* of *salvation*, by being thus made *members* of the *church*, out of which there is no *promise* of *salvation*.

1. *Reh.* I Have a question to ask you, *countryman*. Suppose you had a *grant* of an *estate* or *office* from the *king*, but it was to pass the *great seal*; and my lord *chancellor* not being in the way, would you *counterfeit* the *great seal* to secure your *grant*?

C. No, surely, I should be *hanged* for *treason*, and lose my *grant* into the bargain.

R. Then you would think it safer to trust the *king*'s promise, and tell him how it was not in your power to have the *great seal* put to the *grant*.

C. Without doubt, and the *king* would lay no blame upon me for what was not in my power to help.

R. Now I apply it, *countryman.* We have a *promise of salvation* by the *redemption* of *Christ*; but it is requir'd that this *grant* be *signed* and *sealed* by *baptism.* The *apostles* and their *successors* the *bishops* of the *church* are those impowered by *Christ* to affix this *seal* of *baptism* to the *grant*, either by themselves or their lawful *deputies* whom they shall impower to do it; such as the *priests* and *deacons*, to whom they give this *commission*, by solemn *words*, and the laying on of their *hands.*

2. Now suppose I were in a place where none of these were to be had, shall I take upon me to affix the *seal* my self? or shall I constitute *priests* or *deacons* to affix it for me? or shall I rather chuse to want it, since I cannot have the proper *officers*, and trust to the *mercy* of *Christ?*

C. I should chuse the last; it would be much greater *humility* in me, and *trust* in *God* too, who, I would not doubt, would supply the defect which was not in my power to help, than to *counterfeit* the *great seal* of *heaven*, and to take upon me to appoint *officers* to represent *Christ*, and to *sign* and *seal* his *covenant*, as his *attornies*, in his *name*, to whom he gave no such *commission.* This would be to *usurp* the *prerogative* of *God*, and the highest *treason* against the *king* of *heaven!* I should think my *grant* much more secure without any *seal*, than with such a *seal*, and so *affixed.*

3. *R.* For this reason the *Jews* now all over the world chuse rather to have no *sacrifice* than any where else but at *Jerusalem*, to which their *sacrifices* were limited by the *law.* It is safer to leave it to *God* to supply the *defects* that are *unavoidable*, than to do it our selves by new *inventions* of our own; for these do not *supply*, but make our *crime* the greater. But *God* can *supply*, and we doubt not will, when the *fault* is not in us; for he is not *tied* to the *institutions* he *prescribes* to us, but we are *tied* up to them, and may not *dispense* with m, when possibly in our power.

4. God

4. God might have healed *Naaman* without the *waters* of *Jordan*; but when that was *prescribed*, he had not been *healed* if he had not gone thither; or if he had dipt himself in any other *river*, it would have been a *contempt*, a *chusing* for himself, and would not have *cured* his *leprosy*.

Let them think of this who despise *baptism*, because of the seeming *weakness* and *easiness* of the *means*, who say with *Naaman*, are not *Abana* and *Pharpar*, rivers of *Damascus*, better than all the *waters* in *Israel*? May I not *wash* in them and be *clean*? *Behold, I thought he* (Elisha) *would come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper*. And I will answer them with the servants of *Naaman*, *If the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? How much rather then, when he saith to thee, Wash and be clean?* 2 Kin. v. 9, &c.

5. If *Naaman* had *prayed* from morning till night, without going down to *Jordan*, after it was commanded, and said, is there not more efficacy in *prayer* than in a little *water*? and if he had *dipped* but *once*, or *six* times instead of *seven*, he had not been healed. *God* will be *punctually* obeyed, and he will be served in *his own way*, and not in *ours*. Yet some make *prayer* justle out all the *institutions* of *God*, and say, what signify *outward* things? the *heart*, the *heart* is all! If that be right with *God*, you need not fear! *Outward ordinances* are *carnal*, and made only for *babes* in *grace*, who have not attained to *perfection*, and the *spiritual life*! But St. *Peter* was of another mind, who said, *Can any forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?* Act. x. 47. *Cornelius* and those with him had a *miraculous* effusion of the *Holy Ghost*, even the gift of *tongues*, the same as given to the *apostles* at *Pentecost*. They had received the *baptism* of the *Holy Ghost*, yet St. *Peter* thought the outward *baptism* by *water* was necessary even to them; as it was to St. *Paul* after he was *con-*

verted by *Christ* himself in person from *heaven*, and had his *sight* restored to him by a *miracle*; yet after all this, it was said to him, *And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, Act. xxii. 16. Yet some cry among us, how can *water* wash away *sin?* But our 27th *article* (which the *Review* has done well to quote) expresses it very forcibly, saying, that by *baptism*, when *rightly* received, as by an *instrument* we are *grafted* into the *church*, and the *promises* of the *forgiveness* of *sin*, and of our *adoption* to be the *sons* of *God*, by the *Holy Ghost*, are visibly *signed* and *sealed*. It is an outward *instrument* or *deed* of *gift*, which, for our greater assurance, is thus *visibly* perfected, *signed* and *sealed* on *God*'s part, before our eyes, by his lawful *attornies*, whom he has *impowered* so to do, in his *name*, and as *representing* his *person*.

6. *C.* But the *presbyterians* knowing they have none such among them, none who can shew their *credentials* from *heaven*, either by *miracle*, or by *episcopal ordination*, which was the *ordinary* means of conveyance thro' the whole world for 1500 years after *Christ*; therefore have taken all the pains they can to lessen the esteem of the *institution* of *baptism*, that men might not be too *curious* in examining whether they have it *rightly*, the *caution* which our *article* puts; therefore their *teachers* (as an example to the *people*, and to take off their *edge* as to *baptism*) will see their own children *die* before their faces without *baptizing* them, unless it happens on a *preaching-day*. And then to be sure the *people* must think there is no great matter in it, when their *preachers*, who say they have a *right* to *administer* it, think it not worth giving to their own *children*.

7. *R.* The care of the *apostles* was much greater in this matter; for when about 3000 of the *Jews* were *converted* at one time, and asked the *apostles*, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* The first thing the *apostles* enjoined to them was, to *Repent and be baptized*, Act. ii. 37, &c. *And they that gladly received the word were baptized——And the Lord added to the church daily such as*

should

should be saved. This was the means *God* had appointed for *salvation*, to be added to the *church* by *baptism.* And it is said, *ver.* 39. *The promise is to you and to your children.* But the *presbyterians* think *their children* may do well enough without it!

Wednesday, January 12, 1708. N°. 387.

---

1. Bitter *pamphlets* now come out against the *church.*
2. Yet the *Observator* is very angry that *Issachar* dare *kick.*
3. The *anabaptists* and *quakers* sprang from the *presbyterians*, and learned from them, the one to deny *baptism* to *infants*, the other to lay it quite aside.
4. Mr. *Wall*'s late book a full answer to the *anabaptists.* *Origen* says, it was the custom of the *church* to *baptize* infants.
5. *Short* answers are the *clearest*, when they hit right.
6. A *short answer* to the *objection*, that *infants* do not understand the nature of *baptism.*
7. That *teach* is put but before *baptize*, Matt. xxviii. 19.
8. That there is no express *text* for *baptizing* of *infants.*
9. The *presbyterians* are fondest of that *command* which stands most upon the *authority* of the *church.*

1. *Coun.* THE *Observator* is violent anew in hunting the *Scots members* upon you, *master*, for speaking against the *kirk.*

R. But I have no body to complain to for all the *reproaches* and vile *calumnies* he and his *party* throw out every day upon the *church!* I have seen the *Second Edition* of a *Letter from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend in England against the Sacramental Test, as inconsistent with the union*, &c. printed and sold by *Benj. Bragg*, at the *Raven*, in *Pater-noster Row.* This is but very lately published for this session of *parliament*, and come out already in new *editions.* And this lays the *rebellion*

of *forty-one*, and the *murder* of king *Charles* I. upon the *church* of *England*; and says, p. 13. *It is notorious the church of England has degenerated*——And the *church* must bear all this! But if you speak a word of the *kirk*, the *Observator* is upon you, and says the *government* ought to take notice of it, as inconsistent with the *union!* And the good friends of the *church* cry out *moderation* to her! but not a word to the *dissenters* to forbear their *insults* upon the *church!* They would have all the *moderation* on one side! I began not with them; the *church* had been long *battered* and *abused* (so as no *church established* ever was) before I took *pen* in hand. All I have wrote has been *defences* in *answer* to their bitter *invectives*; yet I am the *inflamer*, and they practise *moderation!*

2. *C.* It is hard indeed if the *church* has not liberty to *justify* herself when she is *accused*, and rendered *odious* to all the *nation!* she is then true *Issachar!* But though an *ass* will not *bite*, yet she must *winch* a little and *kick* when she's over loaded! though she has nothing to say, but *passive-obedience* on the one side, and *non-resistance* on the other.

But, *master*, before you say any thing to this *pamphlet* you have named, or go to any other subject, I would entreat you to prosecute the matter we were upon one step further before it go out of my head, and give me something to say to the *anabaptists* who deny all *infant baptism*, and they increase much of late.

3. *R.* That *sect* sprang out from the *presbyterians*, and the transition was natural, from denying *baptism* to *infants*, except upon a *fare-day* or so, to take it from them altogether. And why not, if it was not necessary to them, and that they were safe without it? And thence the *quakers* (who came from the *presbyterians* likewise) improved further, and thought it not necessary to *men* more than to *children*; for if it was but a *ceremony*, it might be taken away. And by the *presbyterian* principles (who clamour'd against all *ceremonies*) it ought to be *abolished*.

4. But

4. But as to the *anabaptists*, I refer them to Mr. *Wall* his *History of Infant Baptism*, printed 1707, which has made an end of that controversy for ever. He has plainly shewed, that *baptism* was in use among the *Jews* before the coming of *Christ*, and was given to *infants*; and that it was so continued in the *church* from the days of the *apostles* to the *anabaptists*. *Origen* (*Homil.* 8. in *Levit.* c. xii.) says in express words, that it was the *Usage of the church to baptize infants*, *Secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari*. You will see many more authorities in Mr. *Wall* his excellent book. There are some books that are *concluding* books which *exhaust* the *subject*, and leave nothing to be *replied*; and this is one of them, upon this subject of *infant baptism*.

5. *C.* But, *master*, referring to *books* will not do in conversation; I must have something to say to the *questions* they ask me. And you use to have a short way of coming to what you call the *jugulum causæ* at once, to find out the *point* on which the whole *cause* does depend, and to *strike* there; which, if done effectually, is the *clearest*, as well as the *shortest* way; for it is easily *remembered*, and is always at hand upon occasion; besides it stops *reply*, for they must answer to one single *point*: whereas when there are many *branches* in a dispute, it is more easy to turn from one to another, and so confound. Therefore I will tell you what they say to me, and I expect *short* answers.

6. They say, that *infants* do not understand the nature of *baptism*.

R. As much as of *circumcision*, to which they deny not but *infants* were admitted.

7. *C.* They say, that the command *Matt.* xxviii. 19. was first to *teach*, and then to *baptize*.

R. That must be the method with *men* who are to be *converted*. But the literal reading of that *text* according to the *original*, is Μαθητίσατε *Go and disciple all nations*, *baptizing them*, &c. then follows, *Teaching them to observe*, &c. Now though a *man* must be first *taught*,

yet a *child* is made a *disciple* or *scholar* of the *school* before he is *taught*. And when a man was *proselyted*, his *children* were *baptized* with him, as it was with the *Jews*, which is the meaning when it is said that such a man was *baptized* and all his *house*, *all* or *his*, Act. xvi. 33. And it was as well understood in the language of that time as if *children* had been named. And it would have been a *redundance* to have named them, for the custom was universal. It was as needless as to have named the *women*, who no body doubts were included. And as little did they doubt of the *infants*. It would rather have made a *doubt*, to have named them, as if they had not been included before.

8. *C.* This is very plain to me; but nothing will serve them, unless I can produce a *text* in the *New Testament* expresly for *baptizing* of *infants*.

R. They must produce a *text* for *excluding* of *infants*, for they were in *possession* of this *privilege* before. And if they will stand to this rule, they must exclude *women* from the sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, or else shew either *command* or *example* for it in the *New Testament*, which they cannot do. Desire them to shew you such an express *text* prohibiting *polygamy*, or for the observation of the *Sabbath*; it is called a *shadow*, and fulfilled in *Christ*, Col. ii. 16, 17. And there is no *command* for keeping the *first-day* of the week as a *Sabbath*. The authority of the *church* must come in here.

9. *C.* And let me here mind an observation I have heard from you; that as the *viper* carries an *antidote* to its own *venom*, so providence has ordered it, that most *errors* have in themselves what is a flat *contradiction* to them. Thus the *presbyterians* set out upon running down the authority of the *church* (because it was all against them) and they would have nothing but what was expresly in *scripture*. And yet of all the *ten commandments* they were fondest of the *fourth*, which only (as to the alteration of the *day*) stands wholly upon *church-authority*. They made more stir about *Sabbath-breaking* than the breach of all the rest of the *Decalogue*. But I have more to say next time.

Sa-

Saturday, January 15, 1708. N° 388

1. As the *presbyterians*, who set up the *scripture* against the *church*, stick most to that *command* which has least of *scripture* and most of *church* authority: so the *quakers*, who set up the *spirit* against the *letter* of the *scriptures*, stick more superstitiously to the *letter* than any other people in the world.
2. I return to the *anabaptists*.
3. They own that *infants* may be capable of *baptism*.
4. *Circumcision* was a *seal* of the *gospel covenant*.
5. It was no *institution* of the *law*.
6. As little doubt of *infant baptism* as of *infant circumcision*.
7. More reason to exclude *women* than *infants* from *baptism*.
8. *Gen.* xvii. 10. with *Matt.* xxviii. 19. is a *gospel precept* for *infant baptism*.
9. A further attestation of our Blessed *Saviour* himself, that *circumcision* was no *legal* institution.

1. *Coun.* I Told you last time I had more to say upon that head of the merciful disposition of *providence*, that *errors* often carry their own *confutation* in themselves. And I remember you gave me another instance besides that of the *presbyterians* which I mentioned last. I love to rub up my memory, that I lose not the benefit of those instructions you have given me; therefore as it is remarkable how the *presbyterians* cut the grass under their own feet, in their being so very strict as to the observation of the *first-day* of the *week* (which they still call the *sabbath*) when there is nothing for that *day* but the authority of the *church*; and at the same time they set up the *scriptures* against the authority of the *church*, as their *foundation principle*: so (as you told me) the *quakers* set up the *spirit* against the *scriptures*; they call the *scriptures* the *letter*, say, they were wrote

to

to other people, and bind none now, unless the same things are commanded *anew* by the same *spirit* that gave forth the *scriptures*, which they say now resides in them, and is their only *rule* as to *faith* and *practice*, without the help of any thing else. And yet these despisers of the *letter* prove to be the most superstitious *literalists* and observers of the *letter* that ever were in the world, and make a *conscience* of the words *thee* and *thou*, and set it up as their *characteristick* to distinguish them from all other *people!* And this is not the *letter* of the *original scriptures*, but of our *English* translation, which yet fails them, for we find *you* and *your* given to a *singular*, as *Job* xviii. 2, 3. and several other places. And the whole *people* of *Israel* are as oft spoke to in the *singular* of *thou* and *thee* as in the *plural* of *you* and *your*.

2. But our business is not now to enter upon this dispute with the *quakers*, and this is a digression. I have something still to ask you as to the point of the *anabaptists*, I think the answer you have given is sufficient as to *infants* not being named, more than the *women*, in the command to *baptize all nations*, for that must be understood according to the known and received *notion* and *practice* of that age, and of the ages before. And if *infants* had been named, it would have looked as if they had not been within the *covenant* before. But yet if in the gospel *infants* had been named, if you could find any such *text*, it would be the *shortest* way indeed, and the *clearest* too.

3. *R.* If *infants* are capable of being within the *covenant* of *grace*, then they are capable of receiving the *signs* and *seals* of it.

C. Yes, the *anabaptists* allow this, that whoever is capable of *church membership* (as they call it) is capable of the *signs* and *seals* of it. Nay, an eminent *preacher* of theirs owned to me (upon my urging our *Saviour's* blessing of *infants*, commanding them to be brought unto him, and saying, that *of such was the kingdom of God*, Mark x. 14. And that *John* the *Baptist* was *filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb; and*

leaped

leaped in her womb for joy of the salutation of the blessed *virgin*, Luke i. 15, 44. Therefore that we could not determine how far or in what manner God might communicate of his *Holy Spirit* to *infants*. I say, upon this he owned to me, that *infants* might be capable of *baptism*, but in regard that we knew not who were capable and who not, therefore that they gave it to none. I told him, I thought that was a better argument to give it to all; for how should we *exclude* whom *God* has not *excluded?* He said he would yield all, if there was any such *precept* for it in the *gospel*. Therefore I come to you, to see if you can help me in this.

4. *R.* I think I can, and the *text* I name to you is *Gen.* xvii. 10. *This is my covenant*, &c.

C. O *master*, you forget your self, it was a *gospel* proof I was asking.

R. And I have given you one, it is called the *gospel* preached to *Abraham*, Gal. iii. 8. *That in his seed all nations should be blessed. He saith not unto seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.* This was the *gospel-covenant*, and *circumcision* was then given as the *seal* of it; and by express command was to be administered to *infants* at eight days old.

5. *C.* But they will take nothing by way of analogy from the *law*; they say *circumcision* was a *legal institution*, and therefore that we can argue nothing from it.

R. It was no *legal institution*, it was *instituted* 430 years before the *law*, and as an *evangelical-institution*, which the *law* could not disannul or take away, as the *apostle* argues, *Gal.* iii. 17. *And this I say, that the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was* 430 *years after, cannot disannul.* So that the *gospel-covenant*, which was before the *law*, stands still good notwithstanding of the *law*. All the difference is, that instead of the *bloody seal* of *circumcision*, *Christ* (who abolished the bloody types) did substitute that more easy of *baptism*. The *seal* is altered, but the *covenant* is the same.

6. Pray

6. Pray ask your *anabaptists*, if instead of *Go and baptize all nations*, &c. it had been said, Go and *circumcise* them, whether they would have had any scruple of admitting *infants?* Then let them give a reason why *infants* should not be admitted to *baptism* as well as to *circumcision*, they being both *seals* of the same *covenant*, succeeding one another at different times?

7. *C.* And *baptism* is the more extensive *seal*, for *women* are capable of it; therefore they are admitted, though they are not *named* in the *commission* of *Go and baptise all nations*. And if *women* are *admitted* upon the *equity* of the *command*, who had not the *seal* before, because they are in the *covenant*, and therefore have a right to the *seal*, where it is such as may be applied to them; how can those *infants* be *excluded* to whom it was commanded to give the *seal* before? And this supposes they were within the *covenant*, nay, it is expresly said, *Gen.* xvii. 14. That the reason why the *male-child* that was not *circumcised* was to be *cut off*, was, *Because he hath broken my covenant*. Now none can *break* any *covenant* who is not in it, far less if he is not *capable* of being in it, which is the reason the *anabaptists* give for *excluding* of *infants*.

8. *R.* And I having before shewed, that this was the *gospel-covenant*, and a *gospel-precept*, and not a *legal*, I think I have satisfied your demand, in giving a *gospel-text* for *infant-baptism*, that is, *Gen.* xvii. 10. with the new *seal* added *Matth.* xxviii. 19. Both are *gospel-precepts*, and *institutions* of the *gospel*.

C. It is *clear* and *undeniable!* and with this I think my self party enough to battle all the *anabaptists* in *England*, for if they deny *Gen.* xvii. 10. to be the *gospel*, they must deny *Gal.* iii. 8. too, which expresly says so.

9. *R.* And if they will not believe St. *Paul*, that *circumcision* was not a *legal* institution, let them hear *Christ* himself, who said, *Joh.* vii. 22. *Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision, not because it is of Moses. but of the fathers*. It was continued by *Moses* under the *law*, because it was enjoined to the *fathers* ever since *Abraham*.

But

But the *institution* was purely *evangelical*, and of *faith* in *Christ* only, and not at all with any respect to the *law*.

C. Therefore the *covenant* into which *infants* were admitted by *circumcision*, was the same as now by *baptism*, that is, the *covenant* of *grace*, the *gospel-covenant*, and had nothing to do with the *law*. And *Gen.* xvii. 10. was certainly a *gospel-precept*.

Wednesday, January 19, 1708. No. 389.

---

1. How the *Observator* and I hit it.
2. We both mean the same thing, but he will fall upon the *ministry*, and I cannot keep him from it.
3. He takes *care* not to *hurt* me.
4. He brings me off cleverly as to the *abdication*.
5. And yields a compleat *victory* as to the power of the *people*.
6. What good the *Rehearsals* would do in *Poland*. The *law* is the *stint* of *liberty* and *property*.
7. The *Observator* likes every thing, he says, I have done, except against the *whigs* and *dissenters*.
8. What every one likes best, next to his own, is *best* by the confession of all.

1. *Coun.* HAVE you, *master*, been *concerting* again with the *Observator*? You make pure *diversion* for the town; for in his of the 5th instant he falls a *railing* intolerably upon you, and *hallooes* the *Scots members* against you over again. And in yours of the same date you *expose* him and *laugh* at him for it, as if you had known beforehand what he would say! there must be some *fellow-feeling* betwixt you!

2. *R.* He has liberty to make as free with me as he pleases; that's by agreement! I have promised to take nothing ill from him! but I cannot persuade him for my life to keep clear of the *government* and the *ministry*! he will break his shins do what I can! he arraigns the *administration* with no less than *scandalous neglect* in not

not *prosecuting* me; and yet he says, *Were I to chuse his punishment, it should be no other than a private retirement, good treatment, and an able physician.* If this be the *sentence*, I promise you I'll plead *guilty*. The *Observator* has hit my humour to a T; we're better acquainted than every body thinks! and we both mean the same thing, though we look different ways! You are to take no more notice of some *familiar* words we use to one another now and then, than of the *scolding* of *lawyers* at the *bar*, they are not a bit less *friends* at the bottom! it is only to gull the poor *clients*, as we do our *auditors!*

3. *C.* I profess I begin to believe you! for I observe that he never accuses you of any thing but where he is sure you are *safe*, and *deserve* rather the *thanks* than the *censure* of the *government*; as in the first place, to free the *queen* from the *coercion* of her *subjects*, which must be very grateful to her, and to all who wish her well; and then to give a turn to the *revolution*, and save it from being a *coercion*, which you will not say but would save it from some objections: and if herein you should fail, yet every body else must say, that it was well *intended*, and that thou art a very *honest* fellow!

R. And that I might not fail in my proof, he has furnished me with the *debates* of the *convention*, which shew plainly that they went upon *abdication*, and that by *abdication* they meant a *free* and *voluntary renouncing!*

4. *C.* Ay but *master*, he has put a *spoke* in your *wheel*, for in his of the 20th of *Nov.* last, *Num.* 80. he has given you several *speeches* made in the *convention* which plainly imply *coercion*; and you have not said a word to that yet.

R. But he was still kind to me in the matter, for he makes all the *managers* of the *house* of *commons* at the *conference* to be for *abdication*. The lords were for *desertion*, but the *commons* would not agree to it, for a man might *desert* for *fear* or *compulsion*; therefore they would have it a free and voluntary *abdication*, to keep it clear from any colour or objection of *coercion*: and the *abdication* did carry it, and the *lords* came into it,

and

and it passed the *vote* of both *houses*. And what signifies what any *member* of either *house* says against any *bill* when it is *debated* in the *house*? the major *vote* determines it, and when it is passed into a *law*, it is as good an *act of parliament* as if it had gone *nemine contradicente*. So that those *speeches* the *Observator* quotes make nothing against me. He knew they did not, and that I was fully justified who went upon the *abdication*; but he brought them in only to shew his respects to some noble *lords*, who have the misfortune not to be in his *good graces!* though I told him before, that I had heard some concerned in those *debates* deny their part as it is printed. But he has had his *stroke* at them, and there's an end on't. And he cannot deny but that I have the *convention* on my side of the argument, for *abdication* against *coercion*; neither will he dispute any more that the *laws* of the *land* are not expresly against *coercion*, particularly the *statute* 12 *Car*. II. c. 30. even according to the *letter*, damning *coercion* by *name*.

5. And for the *foundation-work* of the *original power* of the *people*, and the *state of nature-government*, I dare say he will not undertake the defence of it, after he has seen how *Lock*, *Milton*, *Sidney*, &c. have been mauled upon that head, even till *Daniel De Foe* himself has quit them all, and thrown down the *cudgels*. He has seen that *principle* not only *disproved*, but made *ridiculous*, *contradictory* to it self, and to all *government*, against *scripture*, *fact*, and all *common sense*; not only *improbable*, but *impossible* to be, or ever to have been.

C. You have a complete and intire *victory* in this; so that not a *dog* of *legion* (who were all about your ears) dare now so much as *bark* at you. They only *fry* in their *grease*, and *curse* you privately by their *Gods*, *Belial* and *Beelzebub*, who, under the false notion of *liberty* and *property*, have made *drunk* the *nations*, and turned them into ruinous *heaps*.

6. I wish *Poland* had a set of your *Rehearsals*, it would do them more good than all their three *kings*, with the help of *Muscovites*, *Swedes*, *Saxons*, *Cossacks*, and

and *Tartars*, to preſerve their *liberty* and *property!* And what though they have undergone the *three* great *ſcourges of ſword, famine*, and *peſtilence*, what ſignifies all that, ſince they have the *liberty* to chuſe another *king!* And the *Poſt-Man* of the 6th tells us, that the *grand general*, one *Siniawſky*, will ſet up prince *Conſtantine Sobieſky* on condition he marry his *daughter*, and that the *republican* party will on that conſideration *elect* that *prince* for their *king*. Deluded *mob!* not to ſee that this is the end which all *patriots* for *liberty* drive at, even their own advantage! and it is not *two-pence* to the *people* which of all theſe *competitors* is their *king*, nor do they know that one will govern better than another: yet they will be *impoveriſhed* and ſpend their *heart's blood* for one againſt another! and their *patriots* tell them they muſt *cut* one another's *throats* to ſecure their *liberty! England* was once thus *infatuated*; let us never ſee it again! No more *York* and *Lancaſter!* nor *Olivers* for *deliverers!* Let us make the *laws* our *rule*, and not learn to *break* them, in order to *preſerve* them. Let us think that only to be our *liberty* and *property* which the *law* allows. All beyond this (as *coercing* of our *ſovereigns*) is *licentiouſneſs* and *anarchy*, and ends in *confuſion*.

7. *R.* Yet this *doctrine* is that for which the *Obſervator* is ſoliciting the *government* againſt me. He ſuppoſes me to be the *author* of ſome books againſt the *Deiſts*, *Socinians*, &c. and expreſſes himſelf pleaſed with them, but is very angry at the *Rehearſals* and *Regale*. I have ſpoke of the *firſt*; and for the *Regale* (ſuppoſing me to be the *author*) it is wrote againſt *eraſtianiſm* and *popery*; and would perſuade the *papiſts* to leave their *errors* and ſo be *reconciled* to us. Let the *Obſervator* tell which of theſe he diſlikes.

8. I have heard moſt of thoſe againſt whom the *author* has wrote, ſay, he does well againſt the *others*, but what has he to do with *us?* Which makes me conclude him equally good againſt all. And if you are the *author* (but I will aſk no queſtions) I will ſay, that you have wrote nothing in your life with greater *demonſtration*, than in your *Rehearſals* againſt *coercion* and the power of the *people*.

Dat-

Wednesday, January 22, 1708. N° 390.

1. They told us from *Holland* three years ago, that the *sacramental test* would be taken away.
2. The *church* will not be *awakened* by it.
3. And the *dissenters* will not rest *satisfied* with it.
4. They already (upon the supposition) claim the whole *administration*, and propose a *test* to exclude every *churchman*.
5. This *test* must throw down our *liturgy*, *articles*, *homilies*, and the *act of uniformity*.
6. They are beginning their old trade again, to *talk* men out of their *places*. They want the *fleet*.
7. Their desire to *repeal* the *sacramental test*, shews they were not pleased with their *occasional conformity*.
8. *Puss* will be *puss* still.

1. *Coun.* YOU have said nothing yet, *master*, of this grand *project* now a foot, which is the talk of the town, to repeal the *sacramental test*. The *Observator* pushes it on, and several *pamphlets* have been wrote for it, as inconsistent with the *union*, &c.

R. I told you, N. 81, *Jan.* 12, 1705, that this *project* was then a brewing, long before the *union*; I had my information from *Holland* (the best *English* news comes from thence) and gave you the very words of the *Harlem Courant* of *Aug.* 27, 1705, which tells, that it was the resolution of the *junto* in *London* to take away the *sacramental test*, &c.

C. But you should say something now; are you unconcerned in this matter?

R. Yes, *countryman*, because I know not which is best, whether that *test* should be taken away, or not?

2. *C.* That's strange! have you forgot the *park-keeper* and the *dear stealer*? Do you think it for the *park-keeper*'s security to have the *pales* of his *park* pulled down?

R. Yes,

R. Yes, if the *noise* of it would *awaken* him out of his *lethargy*. He might defend his *park* better without *pales* when he is *awake*, than with them when he is *asleep*.

C. I'm afraid you're *crusty*, master. And do you think that the pulling down of the *pales* would not *awaken* the *park-keeper?* or that he may not be *awaken* without it?

R. I think neither with it, nor without it.

C. Then you give over the cause.

R. It is long since I did that.

C. What did you struggle for then? What have you been talking of the *church* for all this time?

R. I have done my duty, and if that will not do who can help it? there is a *fate* in it!

C. But you must never give over a good thing; you know not when the *lucky hour* may come.

R. When the *sky* falls, we shall catch *larks*——It was a sad fate upon *Cassandra*, but worse upon the *Trojans*, that she was not to be *believed* till the *ruin* came.

Suppose the *sacramental test* was taken off; what then, *countryman?*

3. *C.* Why then the *dissenters* would certainly be *pleased*; for then they would be capable of all places of *power* and *trust*, equal to *churchmen*; and sure they would never desire more.

R. I thought so! thou talk'st like an errant *churchman!* I told you that all this would not *awaken* them! and you have found an argument already for folding of the hands to *slumber!* for *Issachar* saw that *rest* was good! I told you from the beginning, that the *dissenters* would never be pleased with new *acquisitions*, but in order to get more, and I blame them not, for all mankind would do the same. Would not every *party* in the world desire to be *uppermost?* Would any refuse the *means* when it is put in their *power?* when they were *encouraged* and *courted* to't! I write not against *them* now, I write against the *church*.

C. This

C. This is a *hip-day* with you. But did any of the *dissenters* ever say, that they would not be content to be upon a *level* with the *church?*

4. *R.* Say so! would you have them *fools*, to *proclaim* their *designs*, and set the *church* upon her guard? yet such *fools* they are, and yet she will not *believe* them! but not *fools* neither, for they know she cannot be *awakened!* they have *enchanted* her! she loves to be *bullied*, and see *what will come of it!*

The *Observator* of the 8th instant, *Num.* 94. has already *proclaimed* it, as the *herald* of the *party*, that they will not be content with an equal *share* in the *administration*, but that they must have *all*; and not one *churchman* in the nation shall be *employ'd*, but *turned out of all posts in church and state*. These are his words, and he proposes a new *test* to discover any who have one *drachm* of *church-blood* in them; and that this be sent to *purge* the *universities* and the *clergy*.

C. What *test* is that he would be at?

R. He calls it, *a test to oblige men of arbitrary principles, either to renounce them, or quit their posts in church and state*.

C. So then, this will be a thorough *reformation!* not only to preclude these *arbitrary* men from coming into *places* hereafter, but to turn out from what *posts* they are in, in the *church* as well as in the *state*.

5. *R.* And how easy is it to call any body a man of *arbitrary principles!* the meaning is the doctrine of *passive obedience*; and then out go every one of the *clergy* of *England*, for they have all subscribed the *homilies*, as enjoined by *act of parliament*. And the *six* last *homilies* against *rebellion* set up *passive-obedience* to the very height, and answer all the *pretences* that ever any *whig* offered for *resistance*, and condemn them all to the very *pit* of *hell*, especially the *first* and *second*, which are particularly ordered to be read every 30th of *January*, or a *sermon composed upon the same argument*, as the *Rubrick* directs, as it stands confirmed even since the *revolution*. So that the *book of Common Prayer* must go too, and our

39 *articles*, where these *homilies* are all inserted, and the *act of uniformity* which enjoins the *subscription* of these *articles*. All these must be *un-sworn* by the *test* the *Observator* proposes. And the taking away the *sacramental test* is only in *ordine ad*——to make the rest go down the more *glib*.

C. You will never get any one to believe that any such thing will be *proposed*.

6. *R.* I believe so too, that's what I say; but have I ever guessed wrong yet as to the *encroachments* of the *dissenters* upon the *church?* Have they not *inch'd* it and *inch'd* it on faster than I told you? You would not believe that *such* and *such* men would be *talked* out of their *places!* men who had merited as much from *England* by their services at *sea* and *land* as any who ever filled those *posts*. But they were *churchmen! Le Hogue, Vigo, Gibraltar*, and beating the *French fleet* were nothing when done by a *churchman!* And *Port-Mahone* is with them such another *crow's-nest* as *Gibraltar*, because not done by a *whig!* They *buz* about the town that *Leak* must follow *Rook*, and that there are others as fitting as the lord *high admiral* himself. They spared not his late *royal highness*, but attacked him by name all the while he was in that great *post*, and were not out of hopes to have *talked* him out too! How many battles have I had with the late *Observator* upon this head, for his laying all miscarriages upon the *prince*, and his invidious comparisons of him with the count de *Tolouse* admiral of *France?*——In short they want the *fleet* into their hands! they think not themselves right in their *geers* till then, and then you will remember *Cassandra!*

7. *C.* They long eluded the *sacramental test* by their *occasional conformity*. And having fulfilled that *law* (as they said) yet now they would have it taken away. Why, did not *occasional conformity* sit easy upon their stomachs? But it is *inching!*

8. *R.* Where are those now, who told us how many *occasional conformity* had brought over to the *church?* you see they are *weary* of it! you may judge then how *sincerely* they came into it! *puss* will be *puss* still! Ded-

Wednesday, January 26, 1708. No. 391.

1. A letter sent to me, calling it a *popish* argument to persuade people to take the *safest* side.
2. The argument is good, and all people in their wits will take it. We make use of it against the *papists*.
3. Not they against us, except in one point, which has been sufficiently cleared till they have no more to say.
4. Three *points* for the *presbyterians* to clear, before their *baptisms* can be *valid*, even by their own confession.
5. Our *presbyterians* stand upon a different foot from *Geneva*, *Holland*, or any of the *reformed* abroad, or any *church* that ever was in the world.
6. They own now, that they have no *argument* left, but to stir up *persecution* against me for disowning their *baptism*.
7. In order to which the *Observator* insults the *ministry*, calls them *scandalous* and *unjustifiable*, if they do not *prosecute* me, because *presbytery* is *established* in *Scotland*.

1. *Coun.* I Have a *letter* for you, *master*, there is no *name* to it; but it is in these words:

" Sir, perusing your last *Rehearsal* I was surprized, " among other things, to find you make use against the " *presbyterians* of one of the weakest and most trivial " arguments that the *papists* usually bring against *prote-* " *stants* in general. Your words are these: *Would ten-* " *der parents consider seriously of this, they would not* " *bring them* (i. e. their children) *to at the best doubt-* " *ed baptism, they would not run any hazard of their souls,* " *but go where their baptism was secure, even by the con-* " *fession of the presbyterians, and so would be safe on all* " *sides*. How easily this may be turned by a *papist*, I " leave yourself to judge; and only tell you, that some

" people think, that truth often suffers more by a weak
" defence, than the most vigorous attacks.

I am,

Jan. 6th, *Sir, your most, &c.*
1708.

2. *R.* I believe this comes from a well-meaning man; therefore I will give him a fair answer: That in all the disputes betwixt the *church* of *Rome* and us, we have the advantage of this argument against them in every point but one; for example, they say, that if the *church* thought it fit to give the *communion* in both kinds, to have the publick *offices* in the *vulgar* tongue, to have no *images* or *pictures* of *God the Father* in their *churches*, and over the *altar*, or indeed any where else, and so of other matters, it would do well, and they would be pleased with it, and all of them that ever I met with say, they would be glad, and rejoice in it; and confess, that (bating the *authority* of the *church*) we are on the *safer* side of the question; for none say it is a *sin* to worship *God* without any *image* of *him* before me. Therefore the whole *hazard* lies on the other side, *viz.* whether that be not the *idolatry* forbidden, *Deut.* iv. 12, 15, 16, *&c.* and many other places in *scripture?* Again, it can be no *sin* to receive the holy *sacrament* in both *kinds*, as it was instituted. But the dispute is, whether taking away the *cup* is not *mutilating* the *sacrament*, and consequently *sacrilege*, as pope *Gelasius* called it? And then, whether the *council* of *Constance* had authority to *enact* this *sacrilege*, with a *non obstante* to the *institution* of *Christ*, and the *practice* of the *church*, to that time, which was 1400 years after *Christ?* I say, Sir, we have no plainer and more persuading arguments against the *papists*, than to shew them, that we are on the *safer* side all the way; and would you have us lose this advantage, by running down the argument of being on the *safer* side?

3. But now, Sir, the only point wherein the *papists* pretend to turn this argument upon us, is on account of our *mission*. And this grounded on a false and foolish story they had trumpt up of the *Nag's-head consecration*; but

but this has been confuted, and our first *consecration* so fully vindicated, that, as archbishop *Bramhal* has shewed to us, *the papists* themselves have quitted that pretence, and given it up. The archbishop has printed the original *record* of that *consecration*, which is still preserved, and forth coming; so that there is no dispute of the *validity* of our *ordinations*, nor consequently of our *baptism*.

Therefore, Sir, we may persuade you to the *surest* side, without giving any advantage to the *papists*; for we persuade them by the same argument; and think ourselves on the *safe* side in our disputes with *them*, as well as with *you*.

4. The *dangers* to which you are exposed, and from which we are free, are these:

1. If *presbyterian ordination* be not *valid*, then those so *ordained* are still *lay men*, and have no more right to administer *baptism* than any other *lay-man*.

And, as I have said before, their *administrations* are more *culpable*; because a *layman* or *woman*, who *baptizes* in case of *necessity* only, does not usurp any *authority*, or pretend to the *priesthood*. But the others do, and that in direct *opposition* to the *bishop*, and in *defiance* of his *authority*.

2. How can *presbyterian ordination* be deduced from the *apostles*, if there was not a *presbyterian church* (that is, of *presbyters* without a *bishop*, in our sense of the word, as distinct from, and *superior* to *presbyters*) throughout the whole world for 1500 years after *Christ*?

3. If no instance can be given of any *reformed church*, where the *presbyters* stand out in opposition to their own *reformed* and *orthodox bishops*, and condemn *episcopacy* itself?

I have before quoted *Calvin* saying, that there is no *anathema* too great for such, and *Beza* calls them *madmen*.

5. And now, Sir, give me leave to speak to you with all the *calmness* and *good-will* in the world. If these things cannot be got over *plainly* and *clearly*, then, by

your own confession, *presbyterian baptism* cannot be *valid*, I mean of those among us, who stand out in opposition to our *bishops*. Their *case* is not the *case* of any other *reformed church*; they stand apart from all the *churches* of *Christ* that now are, or ever were in the whole world. If they say not, let them name that *church* which has condemned *episcopacy* as such; that is, as the *head* of the *ecclesiastical hierarchy* upon *earth*. They can name none but the *kirk* in *Scotland* now *established*, and *themselves* when *established* in *England* in the *rebellion* of *forty-one*. Let them try if they can get such an attestation against *episcopacy* from *Geneva*, or from *Holland*. All of whose divines owned the *episcopal character* in one of the *English bishops* present in the synod of *Dort*, they all gave him the *precedence*, and what *honours* were due to a foreign and orthodox *bishop*. But our *presbyterians* say, that *episcopacy* is an *encroachment* and *usurpation* upon the *church* all over the world, as well as in this *kingdom*; and so put themselves in the other *scale* against all the world!

And if their *cause* is thus *destitute*; then, Sir, have I not reason to renew my application to all *tender parents*, that they bring not their *children* to such, at the best, doubted *baptism*, when they may have what is *secure*, by the confession of all the *churches* now in the world, or that ever have been?

And I shall be glad to hear from you again (though unknown to me) how this resolution I have given you, without *passion* or *prejudice*, has satisfied you, or if you have any further *scruple* herein, that my best endeavours may remove.

6. *C.* I hope this will satisfy the gentleman as it does me; and let him see, that all the *answer* you have got to your *arguments* upon this head is bitter *railing*, and setting up downright *persecution* against you, and making you obnoxious to the *government*, if they could. Of which you having admonished the *Observator*, as a *shameful* way of arguing; he, in his of the 12th instant, repeats your charge, and justifies it, and owns, that he

he will foment prosecution against you with all his power.

6. *R.* And in answer to my *caution* to him, not to make himself obnoxious by falling upon the *ministry*; he disdains my advice, and as he had called them *scandalous*, in his of the 5th instant, for not *prosecuting* me, he repeats it again in his of the 12th, and says, *nothing can justify the m——ry's suffering such treasonable insolence to pass unpunished.* These arguments he calls *treason!* Thus he *answers*, and thus he *insults* the *ministry*, and *dictates* to them!

Saturday, January 29, 1708. No. 392.

---

1. The *Review* opens in the *cry* of *persecution* against me.
2. A *promise* of something or other he says was made to the *Scotch presbyterians*.
3. He gives me the *lie*, and calls that a *forgery* which himself confesses to be *true*, and says it deserves the *whipping-post*.
4. Though the *general assembly* has decreed against *private baptism*, and it is generally *refused*; yet he says it is not *refused*, because some give it now and then, if you will take his word.
5. He says *baptism* is not *unnecessary*, it is only *not necessary*.
6. He falsly supposes, that I grant *regeneration* to be given by *presbyterian baptisms*.
7. He condemns *lay-baptism* as *invalid*, and would have such *re-baptized*; therefore the whole *cause* is resolved into the *validity* of the *presbyterian ordinations*.
8. His common *flowers* of *rhetorick*. He would fain have company to the *whipping-post*.

1. *Coun.* YOU have taken no notice, *master*, of the *Review*, who chimes in with the *Observator*

vator, and halloos *persecution* against you for your arguments concerning *baptism*. In his of the 8th instant, N. 123. he clamours for *justice* against you, and says, p. 491. it is not agreeable to the *union*, that you should pass *without due punishment*. And p. 492. that this *justice* was *publickly promised to the* Scots *at the time when the treaty was in transaction*.

2. *R.* I have desired to be rid of the company of this spark; but I see I cannot. He will thrust in, though *experiment* is writ upon his face; and I must do him the honour to speak to him, though it is to bid him be gone. But since he is come, I have a question or two to ask him. Therefore pray, Sir, tell me, what is it was promised to the *Scots* at the *treaty?* Were you one of the *commissoners?* Was it *publickly* promised, and no body knows what it is? And who did *promise* it? Were you present? And what was it was *promised?* To make it *penal* for any of the *church* of *England* to question the *mission* and *baptisms* of the *presbyterians?* And did they not likewise tie the *presbyterians* to their *good behaviour* towards the *church* of *England*, and to *episcopacy?* And have they kept it?

3. *C.* But he says, p. 491. that you *lie*; that what you say is a *down-right forgery*, and *ought to be answered by a whipping-post*.

R. This is his *breeding*, and the *conversation* he has been used to; but what is this *lie*, this *down-right forgery?*

C. He quotes your N. 381. (it should be 384.) where you say, *the presbyterians think private baptism worse than none*.

R. And did I not say, that their *practice* proves it? And he cannot deny their *practice*, that they will suffer their own *children* to *die* without *baptism*, rather than give them *private baptism?* Does not this shew, that they prefer *no baptism?* Why else would they not give them *private baptism?* For the one or the other was all the choice.

4. *C.* He

4. *C.* He says, in answer to you,

" But that there are no *private baptisms* in *Scotland*, " that the ministers cannot *baptize* before *sermon* in the " *assembly*, or in *private* out of the *assembly*; and to af- " firm that they do not is a notorious falsity, contrived " in his own brain (that is, in yours, *master*) and *vo-* " *mited* out with the *overflowing* of his *gall* against the " church of *Scotland*."

R. He is a very *civil* gentleman! But did I say, that there were no *private baptisms* in *Scotland?* Though I never heard of one that did see it among the *presbyterians*. The *Review* says he did; but neither I, nor any body that knows him, will take his word in any thing without good *vouchers*. But suppose it to be true, what does that signify? What if some particular *preacher* among them sees into the *monstrousness* of their *doctrines*, and adventures to *practise* otherwise, he is by that a *non-conformist* to them in so far. And does this absolve the *kirk?* What does he mean then by saying, that *to affirm they do not give private baptism*, is a *notorious falsity*, a *vomiting* and *overflowing of gall*, *&c?* If some do it, yet even he *dare* not affirm, but that generally they do it not. Nay, he himself says, p. 490. *It is true, the church of* Scotland *have made orders against private baptisms*; he means, *acts* of their *general assemblies*, which is the highest *authority* of their *kirk*. Is it not their *doctrine* then? And is it not their *practice* too, though he should find a particular *exception* here or there? To whom now belongs the *falsity* and the *forgery*, the *vomiting* and the *whipping-post?*

5. *C.* He says, you, *as an unfair adversary, would cast a mist before the eyes of the world against the church of* Scotland, *as if they rejected baptism as unnecessary.*

R. Why? Do they not make it *unnecessary*, when they say it is *not necessary?* And if they thought it *necessary*, would they refuse it to their *infants* in *private*, who could not have it in the *publick?* Did any body ever say it was more than *necessary?*

C. And yet he immediately after argues for the *no necessity* of it; and asks, whether a *child* that died before he was eight days old, and was not *circumcised*, was thereby out of the *covenant?* And says, *we read of none circumcised before the eighth day.*

R. They were not to be *circumcised* before the eighth day, *Gen.* xvii. 12. And he that died before was in the *covenant*; for he had not broken it, as likewise all the *females*; for what is *commanded* is sufficient. But *baptism* is made necessary, as well as *believing*, Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.*

6. *C.* He goes on and says, *If baptism be as necessary as you say it is, you lay down the most horrid, hellish, and abhorred position that ever could come out of the mouth of one that calls himself a Christian.* For which he bids see your N. 384. where you say, *better die without baptism* (that is, says he, as inferred from your N. 383. *without regeneration) than have it from the Erastian kirk —So that in short*, (says he) *damnation is with you better than regeneration, if it must come by the hand of a presbyterian minister.*

R. But did I say, that *regeneration* came by that *baptism* which is given by a *presbyterian minister?* If I granted that, then sure I could not find fault with their *baptisms.* But the reason why I grant it not is, because *baptism* is not with them given by those *ministers* to whom *Christ* gave the *commission* to *baptize.* And therefore is *sacrilege* in those who *usurp* it, and is of none effect to those who *receive* it; it is *stealing* the *great seal* of *heaven.* Of which I told you, N. 386.

7. *C.* He says, p. 491. of those *baptized* by a *porter*, (that is, by any *lay-man) that it is no baptism, and they ought to be rebaptized.*

R. Then he does not suppose *regeneration* given by such a *baptism.* Now let him apply, and answer the three *queries* in my last concerning *presbyterian ordination.* Which if he cannot do, nor any body else for him, then they must allow their *baptisms* to be no better than of *lay-men*, and much more *culpable.* And then the *Review* has pronounced *sentence* against them, that their *baptisms* are

are no *baptisms*; and therefore that those who have been so *baptized*, ought to seek the true *baptism* from those who have *commission* to give it.

C. And is this the *point* which he himself has granted, that same *position* which he calls the most *horrid*, *hellish*, and *abhorred* that *ever came out of the mouth? &c.*

8. *R.* These are the common *flowers* of his *rhetorick*, which he uses instead of *argument!* I must forgive him, he is *used* to it, and cannot *help* it!

C. And at the same time he throws off all your *arguments*, by calling them *Billingsgate*; and says, you ought to be answered by the *whipping-post*; he would fain have company!

Wednesday, Feb. 2, 1708. N° 393.

---

1. A new *scandal* raised by the *Review* upon a *prebendary* of the *cathedral-church* of *Durham*.
2. A *party* more *shameless* than he, still employs him.
3. Three *reasons* why no body ought to believe that *story*.
4. A *letter* from a *prebendary* of *Durham* confuting it.
5. The *exposed* condition of the *church* of *England* not to be equalled in any *history*.
6. She is under the *persecution* of the *tongue* severely, and further *threatned*. The bishop of *Durham* and his *clergy* compared with old *Eli* and his *sons*.
7. Former *insults* upon the *clergy*, and *act of uniformity*.
8. The *test-act* now struck at. What the *church* has left, *libera nos* ———

1. *Coun.* I Wonder, *master*, you have taken no notice of a late *Review* of the 15th last *month*, Vol. V. N. 126. which tells a most *scandalous* story of a *prebendary* of *Durham*, who came into the *chapter-house* there *cursing* and *swearing*, *&c.* upon the election of a *lecturer* there. The town is full of it; you cannot go into

any *whig-coffee-house* but they have it by heart, and mix a dram of it, instead of *brandy* into their *tea*, and 'twixt every *sup* cry, O rare *church* of *England!* —— What a fine *clergy* we have! —— What delicate *bishops!* This will gain the *dissenters!*

2. *R.* I thought I had cured every one of common *sense* or *honesty* to believe one word more that ever should come from the *Review* against the *church* or *clergy*. I have detected him in so many studied and deliberate *lies* and *slanders* of this kind, that I thought my task was over. But I find the *party* are not weary of employing him still as their *trumpet* of *scandal* upon the *clergy*; they are more *shameless* than he!

3. When first I heard the *story*, I said I would lay an even wager it was utterly *false*. 1. Because it came from the *Review*. 2. Because it does not tell well, that a doctor of *divinity*, and a *prebendary* of a *cathedral* (especially of *Durham*), which is every where said to be so well regulated, and an *ornament* to the *church* of *England*, should come into the *chapter-house*, upon a serious occasion, with such *rappers* in his mouth without any provocation, in presence of the *bishop*, and all his brethren. And, 3dly, because the *Review* tells it with an *experiment-assurance*, and gives it all the *airs* of undoubted and most certain *truth*. For then it is that I suspect him most from long experience! As you may see in my N. 101. *May* 4, 1706. And I have found no cause to this day to alter the *rule* I there set down as to believing their *stories* against the *church* and *clergy*.

But, *countryman*, there is a letter just now come to my hands, sent by a doctor of *divinity* and a *prebendary* of the *cathedral church* of *Durham* to his friend in *London*, dated *Dur.* Jan. 22, 1708. I will read it to you:

4. " Sir, I question not but you have seen in the *Re-*
" *view*. N. 126. vol. V. a very scandalous libel against
" our society in general; but levelled more particularly
" at some one member of it, who is so injuriously treat-
" ed by that open enemy to the *church* and *clergy*,
" and if the world is not mistaken, to all sound *reli-*
" *gion*,

"*gion.* But which of us ſoever he meant, we can fully "and juſtly vindicate him from that ſlander. For firſt "our *chapter* will publickly *certify*, that the *corporation* "made no application to them about a *lecturer*; and "therefore no ſuch words could be ſpoken, nor anſwer "made in our *chapter*, as he falſly reports. Secondly, "there hath been a *lecturer* ſettled at St. *Nicholai*'s a-"bout ſeven years ſince, which is owing to our body "for the maintenance that is ſettled upon it; for about "twenty years together we all preached in our turns, or "paid for ſupplying them in our abſence, till a compe-"tent ſum could be got to lay out in a purchaſe for a "maintenance, which was about ſeven or eight years "ago. The *mayor* and *aldermen* will alſo *certify* the "ſame thing that we do on their part; ſo that the report "may be affirmed to all the world to be a malicious "and ſcandalous lie, made on purpoſe to bring an *o-*"dium upon the *church* and *clergy*, and particularly on "ours.

"That it may pleaſe God to keep you, and us, and "the *church*, and her whole *clergy*, out of the hands of "ſuch *wicked* and *unreaſonable* men, as I doubt not but "it is your conſtant *prayer*; ſo I aſſure you, Sir, it is "the daily ſupplication of

Your faithful friend

And ſervant.

POSTSCRIPT.

"The *certificates* of the *dean* and *chapter*, and of the "*mayor* and *aldermen*, are ſigned, and will be ſent up "to my lord *biſhop* by this poſt, to be made publick, if "his *lordſhip* ſhall think fit."

5. *C.* And is not this fine work, that the *biſhop*, the *dean* and *chapter*, the *mayor* and *aldermen*, ſhould all be put to this trouble, to refute the *ſlanders* every day caſt upon them, with the reſt of the *church* and *clergy*, by a ſet of men employed and ſupported by the *whigs* and *diſſenters*, to wage perpetual *war* upon the *church!*

R. No

R. No ſooner one *lie* is refuted but another is *trumpt* up ——— Great part of my *firſt volume* was imployed in anſwering theſe *ſcandals*; and now we ſee it is endleſs!

I challenge all *hiſtory* to ſhew the like caſe of a *church*, while *eſtabliſhed*, ſo *inſulted* and *trod* upon, *openly* and *avowedly* in *print*, and the *authors* known, with their *names* to their *ſcandals*: And no *remedy!* No, not againſt the moſt vile *inſtruments!* May not ſhe take up the *lamentation* of *Jeruſalem*, and ſay: Judge, I pray you, and ſee, whether there was ever any *caſe* like my *caſe? Is it nothing to you, all ye that paſs by?*

C. Ay! Ay! She may *complain* to thoſe that *paſs by!* But if ſhe ſpeak a word at *home*, let her look to her hits! The *Obſervator* and *Review* will be upon her bones and ſay, ſhe cries the *church* is in *danger!* They whip her till ſhe *cries*, and then *whip* her for *crying!*

6. *R.* If the *perſecution* of the *tongue* be any *danger*, or if it is the ſevereſt ſort of *perſecution*; if it be any *prejudice* to the *church* and *clergy* to be expoſed *five* times in the *week* (betwixt the *Obſervator* and *Review*) in the moſt *ſcandalous* manner, and be made the *jeſt* and *contempt* of all the *people*; if ſo, then her *danger* is *proclaimed* five times a *week*.

C. This ſame *Review* compares the lord *biſhop* of *Durham* and his *clergy* to old *Eli* and his *ſons*, N. 127. The reſt of the ſtory every body knows: *Eli* broke his *neck*, his *ſons* were *ſlain*, the *ark* was taken, and the *Philiſtines* came into the land. This, and the following *Review*, will give the *biſhop* an *action* of *ſcandal. mag.* againſt *De Foe*, who ſets his name to them.

R. Then he runs his diviſions the whole length of his *rhetorick* upon the *church* for want of *diſcipline*. Of which he cannot give a better proof, than that ſhe muſt ſuffer herſelf to be thus *inſulted* by him, and knows not where to find a *remedy!*

7. *C.* It is long ſince he told her in his *ſecond vol.* p. 418. *That one third at leaſt of the inferior clergy in* England *ought to be hanged.* And p. 142. *That three parts*

in

in five of them were in a close conjunction with the enemies of the government. And then to be sure they ought to be *hanged* too! But he is not content with having them all *hanged*, for more may rise up in their place, but he would have the whole *constitution* pulled in pieces, and all the *legal* security of the *church* taken from her. He spends his rage against the *act of uniformity*, and calls it, p. 448. *Scandalous to the church, injurious to the publick peace, and a grievance to the whole nation.* This is *root and branch work!* yet the *church* must sit down quietly under all this!

8. *R.* And now they are attacking the *test act*, but they have received some small rebuke in this; and the *church* has still liberty to pray the *collect* against *persecution* at the end of the *Litany*, and to say *Good Lord deliver us* from the restless attempts of our *enemies*.

Saturday, February 5, 1708. N° 394.

---

1. The *Review* plays his *wallet* against *dean* and *chapter*, *mayor* and *aldermen*.
2. The *whigs* and *dissenters* have *spies* upon the *clergy* all over *England*.
3. The *Review* threatens more of the *chapter* of *Durham*, and to give *black lists* of all the *clergy* in *England*.
4. He falls upon the *bishops*, particularly the bishop of *Durham*, with a terrible account of the *clergy*.
5. All out of *respect* to the *church!*
6. What the *church* suffers by this.
7. The *prejudice* of being *slandered*, though *unjustly*.
8. The *representation* made of the *church* of *England* to *foreign churches* and *countries*. *Le Clerk* lies *leger* for this purpose in *Holland*.

1. *Coun.* HERE's a *trial of skill* betwixt you, *master*, and Mr. *Review*; he is very *positive* in his *story* of the parish of St. *Nicholas* in *Durham* applying

plying themſelves to the *dean* and *chapter* there about a *lecturer*, and the repeated *oaths* and *curſes* of a certain D. D. and *prebendary* of the *cathedral* there, upon no other provocation. He cloſes his *paper* of the 15th laſt *month*, N. 126. with theſe words.

" If either the *dignified drone* himſelf, or any body " elſe, that takes offence at this ſtory, demand a proof " of *fact*, or a *long account* of the like *ſcandalous beha-* " *viour*, either of him or ſome *others* of the ſame *ſociety* " ——My *record* is in my *wallet*, to which *names*, " *ſurnames*, *time*, and *place* are affixed, and ready to be " ſhewn at demand.

R. He has ſet down the *place* already, the *chapter-houſe* of the *cathedral* of *Durham*, and the *time* we may eaſily find by the *occaſion*, the *application* of the *pariſh* of St. *Nicholas* about a *lecturer*. But if there never was any ſuch *application*, then there's an end of all this fine *ſtory!* And for this the only diſpute is, whether is of moſt credit, *De Foe*'s *wallet*, or the *certificates* of the *dean* and *chapter*, and of the *mayor* and *aldermen?*

2. But when theſe *names* and *ſurnames* come out of the *wallet*, then, gentlemen, you will ſee what loving *neighbours* you have, who furniſh your *enemies* with ſuch *materials* to *print* againſt you! you ſee their *moderation!* And ſuch *ſpies* there are all over the *nation*, who make it their buſineſs to *goſſip* about any *ſtory* they hear of a *clergyman*, and if they can *find* none, to *make* them. Then ſend them up to the *Obſervator* or *Review* —— and they're *printed* preſently! Hence came the *ſtories* of *Oakhampton*, *Taunton*, *Northampton*, *Harpenden*, the *Weather-cock* at *Oxford*, and all the reſt which I have been at the pains to confute before.

3. And here the *Review* threatens *others* beſides whom he calls the *dignified drone*, and of the ſame *ſociety* too, with a *long account* of their *ſcandalous behaviour*; and ſays, p. 505. that there are *ſcandalous black liſts of the debauched clergy* all over the nation. And p. 508. he ſays, *while ſuch wretches as theſe are ſpread over this nation, and open vice and prophaneneſs reign among the clergy unreſtrained*——

4. C.

4. *C.* This is upon the *bishops*. And p. 507. he calls the *bishop* of *Durham*, *Old Bishop Eli*, for not correcting this *dignified drone*. And thence prognosticates the downfall of the *church*, as of the *ark* under bishop *Eli*, &c. " The reproach is (says he, ibid.) when this devil is known, and yet suffered, embraced, and let go unpunished." And p. 503. says, " It is known to his superiors." And (ibid.) " When scandalous and impious wretches pass without censure, and such people wittingly permitted to serve at the altar and administer in holy things, who are scandals to a Christian country, the shame of their sex as well as sect, the reproach of their neighbours, and an offence to all sober Christians" ——And p. 506. " when the sons of the church become sons of *Sodom*, and guides to the devil——they grow factors of hell, and stock-jobbers for the devil." Then he makes the application, " That it seems to me (says he) there are the most vicious clergymen suffered, and the fewest punished in the church of *England* of any church or society of religious in these parts of the world." And p. 505. says, " It is surprizing that the disciplinary part of the *English* church should be thus remisly managed——that those who have the government of the church, should hold the reins so slack, and let such black things as these pass unpunished."

5. *R.* Do not stop, *countryman*, till you have told his excuse, why all this is no reflection upon the *church* of *England*. He professes a great respect to her. And the next words to what you last quoted are these,

" Nor am I at all exposing the *church* of *England* in " this, I am sure it is far from my design, *Let them* " *take it as they please, that I am wholly unconcerned* " *about*——If this be not a service to the church in " their esteem, I am sorry for their eye-sight.

I put those words in *Italick* as he does, *Let them take* it, &c. because I suppose he would have you lay particular *stress* upon them.

C. And so we ought, for it shews what a deep *regard* he has to the *church*, that he is so perfectly *unconcerned* how

how ſhe takes all this! and her *eye-ſight* muſt be bad indeed, if ſhe *ſees* not what *loving friends* ſhe has under her roof, whom ſhe *tolerates*, and is required to *cheriſh!* if I had ſuch a *parcel* under my roof——

6. *R.* This is but one *dirty fellow*——what ſignify his *ſlanders?*

C. Is there but *one* of them then, *maſter?* his *name* is *legion.* You have fought with more *beaſts* than St. *Paul* at *Epheſus.* But who encourages this *worthy ſpark*, ſends him *materials*, and ſupports his *paper?* When he's off of *ſcandal*, he's ſo heavily *dull*, that none would be at the *penance* to read him,

And if the man ſuch praiſes have,
What muſt they who keep the k——ve?

R. If the *church* think, that where ſo much *dirt* is thrown, none will *ſtick*, I wiſh I may be the *falſe-prophet.*

7. *C.* I remember once I was telling a very wife neighbour of mine a *ſcandal* ſome had raiſed upon a *friend* of his. But he ſtopt me ſhort, and would not hear it. He ſaid, I love not to hear any *ill things* of a *friend*; for though I am ſatisfied it is *falſe*, yet I cannot help thinking of it when I ſee him, and it *ſullies.*

R. The obſervation is good. A *man* would think himſelf *unfortunate* who was obliged to *vindicate* his *courage*, or a *woman* her *reputation.* None can be more *convinced* than I am of the *falſhood* and *malice* of theſe *accuſations* againſt the *clergy*, becauſe I have *chaſed* ſo many of them and *detected* them. Yet becauſe I know them not all, when I ſee one in that *habit* ride by upon the road, theſe *ſcandals* come into my mind, whether I will or not.

C. You have quoted to me before a remark of the late *Obſervator*, that whenever you ſee a *clergyman* go into a *houſe*, you may conclude it is either to *debauch* the man's *wife*, or to *pick* his *pocket*, and I cannot help thinking of this for my life when I ſee a *clergyman* go

into

into a door. And I have heard idle fellows ſay in the ſtreet, Now! ware *wife* or *pocket*——And this is the reverence we have for our *clergy*, occaſioned by theſe vile *ſtories* that fly about.

8. *R.* But what will foreign *countries* think of our *church?* for theſe *papers* go abroad, at leaſt to *Holland.* And *Le Clerc* may put them into *French*, as he has done the book of the *Rights* in his *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, which goes over *Europe.* And to all theſe countries *De Foe* addreſſes himſelf in the *characters* he gives of our *clergy*,

That *foreign countries* may not ſee
Our eccleſiaſtick *nudity*;
And it become a new *proverbial* jeſt,
To be as *wicked* as an *Engliſh* prieſt.

And to turn his *argument* upon him, when they ſhall hear, that this man is not *puniſhed*, but continues ſtill to write on *Reviews* three times a *week*, in the face of the *church* and *government*, encreaſing every day in theſe *black characters* of the *church* and *clergy*. What can they think, but that all theſe are *true*, and ſo *notorious* as not to be denied! or elſe, that the *church* of *England* has few *friends* who are concerned how *vile* ſhe is rendered to the *world*, and to *poſterity!*

Wed-

Wednesday, Feb. 9, 1708. N° 395.

1. The *church* of *England* allows of none but *episcopal ordinations*.
2. Nor of any other *baptisms*.
3. Several have come to the *episcopal baptism* who had received the *presbyterian*.
4. The *church* has lost by not contending against the *baptism* of *dissenters* more earnestly.
5. Her *moderation* herein compared with that of St. *Peter*.
6. The *moderation* of the *assembly of divines*, and of king *Charles* I.
7. The *English factory* at *Narva* were prohibited from having any of our *dissenters* for their *chaplain*.
8. The *English* and *Dutch merchants* in *Sweden* could not obtain leave to have a *Calvinist* to preach to them.
9. Why a *presbyterian* that *marries* at *Riga* is obliged to give bond to bring up his *children* in the *religion* of the *country*.

1. *Coun.* THERE is one thing in the *Review*, Vol. V. *Num.* 123. I would be glad you would speak to for my satisfaction. He says, p. 491.

" That *baptism* by a *presbyterian minister* is as authen-
" tick as *baptism* by the *archbishop* of *Canterbury*, no re-
" flection upon his grace. And I prove it *(says he)*
" from the practice of the church of *England*, who, as
" much as they object against *presbyterial ordination*, and
" *presbyterial re-ordination*, yet never came up to the
" length to *re-baptize* any that came over to them, who
" had been *baptized* by *dissenting ministers*, though had
" they been *baptized* by a *porter*, it had been no *baptism*,
" and they ought to *re-baptize*.

R. The *church* of *England* does *re-ordain* those *presbyterian ministers* that come over to her, and admits none for *priests* or *deacons* but who have received *episcopal ordination*,

dination, as you may ſee in the *preface* to her *book of ordination*. This ſhews plainly, that ſhe looks upon *preſbyterian miniſters* as mere *laymen*. And you can ſhew me no other confirmation of their *baptiſms* in the *church* of *England*, than of the *baptiſms* of any other *laymen*, which you, Mr. *Review*, your ſelf have condemned.

2. I confeſs ſhe is not ſtrict enough in examining into the *baptiſm* of thoſe ſhe *ordains*, as I am informed is the rule in both the *Roman* and *Greek* churches, that ſuch are obliged to produce *certificates* of their *baptiſm*. By which *neglect* of ours ſome may receive *ordination*, who have not been rightly *baptized*. But you can ſhew no other *allowance* or *approbation* of *preſbyterian baptiſms* in the *church* of *England*. Shew any *canon* or *rubrick* for it. Some by this means may be ſlipt who have had no *baptiſm* at all. Does it therefore follow, that the *church* of *England* allows of no *baptiſm*?

3. But I know ſeveral who were *baptized* in their *infancy* by the *preſbyterians*, and *knowing* it, have ſince received *baptiſm* in the *church* of *England*; and others who *doubted*, had *conditional baptiſm*, &c. that is, *If thou art not baptized already*, &c.

There is one particularly who has let the world know his caſe in print, in a very good *book*, intituled, *Lay-Baptiſm Invalid*, London *printed* for *R. Burrough* and *J. Baker* at the *Sun* and *Moon* in *Cornhill*, 1708. Which was the effect of his *conferences* with ſeveral of the *clergy*, where he heard what was to be ſaid on both ſides, and determined him to be *baptized* in the *church*, he having been *baptized* in his *infancy* by a *preſbyterian miniſter*. And he has not been proſecuted as a diſturber of the *union*!

4. *C.* In my opinion, *maſter*, if the *church* had inſiſted upon this point from the beginning, and boldly *declared* the *baptiſms* of the *diſſenters* to be *null* and *void*, and ſaid with St. *Ignatius* (ad *Smyr.*) that it was not lawful without the *biſhop* to *baptize* nor to celebrate the holy *communion*, ſhe had not loſt ſo much ground as ſhe has, people would have been aware, and they would not

have

have gone to (at the best) *doubted baptisms*. Every good woman would have said, please God there shall be no *doubt* of *my child*'s baptism——But if we let them go on in the opinion, that their *baptisms* are good, not by *approving* them, but even by our *silence* and *letting it go*, how can we dispute their right to *preaching*, which is far less than the authority of administering the *sacraments*, that is, of *signing* and *sealing* the *covenant* of *God* with *men*, in his *name*, and as his lawful *attorneys* and *ambassadors*, representing his *person?* The *greater* includes the *lesser*. And this *power* carries that of *preaching* along with it.

5. *R.* It was *moderation* in our *church*, or rather *churchmen*, thinking to gain the *dissenters* by it; and now it is turned as an argument against the *church*. And if one were to write the *history* of *moderation*, you would find the like effects of it in all ages; I would begin with that of St. *Peter*, Gal. xi. whose *trimming* with the *Jews* carried away *Barnabas* himself and many others into the like *occasional conformity*. And if St. *Paul*, who was a *high-sier*, (and *would not give place, no not for an hour*) had not *withstood him to the face*, we might have been all at this day under the yoke of the *law*, which *neither we nor our fathers were able to bear*.

6. *C.* The like *moderation* governed our *assembly of divines* at *Westminster* in the late times, who, as the *history of non-conformity* printed 1704, tells us, *Pref.* p. 2. *were all of them, except eight or nine, conformable ministers*; but they were an illegal assembly of *moderate* men, and to gain the *dissenters*, abolished *episcopacy*, the *liturgy*, and made *root and branch work* with the *church!* But they had a good *design*, and would have brought all about again——but they wanted time!

R. If they had had some politick *bishops* to have gone along with them, their *reformation* had been compleat! but that was reserved for the blessing of some *after* age!

C. Such was the *moderation* and *politick* of king *Char.* I. to establish *presbytery* in *Scotland*, to secure *episcopacy* in *England*. And So——came of it! and brought him to that sad catastrophe we have lately bemoaned. 6. *R.*

6. *R.* I durst not speak upon that subject, lest the *presbyterians* should say it was a breach upon the *union!* I will go a great way off, and tell you *verbatim* what I had from an *English merchant* who resided several years in *Sweden*, and was then there the first year of the reign of the late king *James*, when the *English* had a *factory* at *Narva*, with the liberty of the free exercise of their *religion*, according to the *church* of *England*; but with this express condition from the *king*, given them by general *Spirling*, governor of *Narva*, that they should bring over no *presbyterian* or other of the *sects* in *England* to be their *minister*, who used to raise disturbances in kingdoms, but only one of the *loyal* and *orthodox divines* of the *church* of *England*. And this they enjoyed till the present *Swedish war* broke the *factory* there. The man they sent for was Mr. *Charles Thirlby*, who since officiates to the *English factory* in *Muscovy*.

8. Much about the same time the *English* and *Dutch merchants* in *Sweden* solicited the *king* for a *Dutch minister* to officiate to them, the *English* there understanding the *Dutch* language. And notwithstanding the letters recommendatory, which they had from the *States General* and the *Elector* of *Brandenbourg*, to that effect, could not obtain leave for a *Calvinist* minister to come thither, for the reasons above.

9. Another passage that happened while this *merchant* was there, was this; Mr. *John Gilbert*, a *presbyterian merchant* at *Riga*, the capital of *Livonia*, about the year 1677 or 1678, courted a *Dutch woman* there, but was obliged (according to the custom there) to have the leave of the *burgo-master* and *raht* (that is, *mayor* and *aldermen*) to marry; which they would not grant (after the utmost solicitation) unless Mr. *Gilbert* would give a bond that his children should be educated in the religion of the country. Which he having done, much against his inclinations, demanded afterward of the *burgo-master* at his house, the reason of this their severity to him; who told him plainly, it was because he was a *presbyterian*, and that they would take what care they could, that

that none of his *principles* ſhould propagate among them; leſt, if they ſhould grow numerous, they ſhould deal with their *king* as they had done with their own.

C. Every body grows wiſer at our expence but our ſelves! and we repeat our *folly* to try how much better or worſe it will be! We love *experiments!*

Saturday, February 12, 1708. N° 396.

---

1. The *Review* draws *bills* at *ſight*, and then demands further *time*, but names none.
2. He *fears* not, but is terribly *afraid* of his *correſpondent*.
3. He puts *preliminaries* before he will tell his *authors* of the *ſcandal* upon the *chapter* of *Durham*.
4. He would fain get off (but cannot) as if his *ſtory* were not of a *prebendary* of *Durham*.
5. He falſly quotes me ſaying, that *Durham* is the *beſt regulated cathedral* in *England*, as reflecting upon others.
6. He civilly deſires the *clergy* to *accuſe* themſelves, ſince he cannot make good his *accuſations* againſt them.
7. He'll tell the *names* of his *informers* about *Durham*, when Mr. *Skey* tells the *names* of his *informers* about the *Experiment*.
8. He has no defence now for his *Experiment*, but bids us go to *law* for it.
9. They have *re-printed* the *Experiment* with a new *title*, that the *ſcandal* upon the *church* may run on.

1. *Coun.* HAVE you heard nothing yet, *maſter*, from the *Review* about his *Durham* ſtory?

R. Yes, *countryman*, he has given us *advertiſement* in his of the 3d inſtant, *Vol.* V. N. 134. p. 536. that he has put off the *cauſe* till he ſhall receive further information.

C. But that is not according to his promise, for he said, p. 504. of the 15th last month, that he was then ready and had his *record* in his *wallet*, to which *names*, *surnames*, *time* and *place* were *affixed*, and *ready to be shewn at demand*. And then when he was *demanded*, he puts it off, and desires further time.

2. *R.* He says, the *letter* he *printed* was from a man *whose reputation he has no reason to question*, and that he *fears it not but he will make the fact appear*.

C. But it seems he had some *fear* about it, why else would he not tell his *name*, *surname*, &c. when he was *demanded* according to his *promise*, and let this gentleman of *reputation* clear himself? But what if he does not clear up this *fact?*

R. Then the *Review* promises, *like a fair enemy*, to *acknowledge his being imposed upon, and to tell by whom*.

3. *C.* But what *time* does he take for this? He might have had an answer from *Durham* before now.

R. He names no time; but he proposes *three* questions for me to answer, and says, *When these things are answered, we may the better reply to the rest, and perhaps, by that time have a further account of things*.

C. By that time—and then, but a *perhaps!* he fences *warily* now! But pray, *master*, what are these three things he would know?

4. *R.* First, he says, *I am an assuming positive gentleman to assure us, that this must be a prebend of* Durham *which the Review no where affirms*.

C. What! does he think we can't read *English*; the *letter* he *prints* in his *Num.* 126. p. 503. says, *It relates to the famous Dr.——one of the prebendaries of our cathedral*. He is an *ingenious* man! and must have some *fetch* in this to shew his *wit!* Some men commit *faults* on purpose to let us see how handsomely they can bring themselves off—Pray go to the next.

5. *R.* He says of me, secondly, *I am sorry to hear him say, it* (Durham) *is the best regulated cathedral in England*.

C. I know not what you have said to him, you never said any such thing to me. I challenge him to shew such a word in your *Rehearsals*. He would have called this *lying* and *forgery* in you, and summoned you to the *whipping-post!* You commend the *regularity* and *order* of that *cathedral*, and I have heard all travellers say the same. But you make no *comparisons* as if there were not others as good in *England*. Is his *third* thing like these *two?*

6. *R.* Better, *countryman*, better a great deal! He says, thirdly, *I wish the clergymen that are to sign the certificates he speaks of, would also sign, that there is not to their knowledge a known habitual swearer among their number, to whom the rappers he talks of are familiar.*

C. This is *better* and *best of all* indeed! This is like the proceedings of the *kirk judicatories* in *Scotland* against the *episcopal clergy* there, of which you told us in yours of the 22d last *December*, N. 22. who put *women* to their *oaths* whether they were not *whores?* and make *husbands swear* if their *wives* had not *cuckoled* them? We see the *Review* has learned something by being so long among his *dear brethren* in *Scotland!* He is hard put to it, when he would have the *clergy* accuse themselves, and make good all the *false* and *malicious stories* the *whigs* and *dissenters* invent of them! And till then (it seems) we are not to expect that *De Foe* will open his *wallet*, and let us know his *informers*.

7. *R.* I remember formerly he sent me to Mr. *Skey* a *tobacconist* at *Queenhith*, where he said the *names* of his *informers* about the *Experiment* were lying all *cut and dry*, and to be shewed to *enemies* as well as *friends*. But it seems I was *neither*, for when I sent upon that *April-errand* not a bit——No, I thank you, no *name* or *names* was to be got there! Mr. *Skey* said he knew them, at least some of them, but did not think fit to tell their *names*, without their own consent; and that *consent* has not been got yet——so there's an end of that matter! though *De Foe* said he had their *consent* to publish their *names*, when there was occasion, And I suppose his

man

man of *reputation* at *Durham* will be as little willing to have his *name* made use of in this new *scandal*, and then Mr. *De Foe* being a *man* of *honour*, must not break the rules of *friendship*, and so may buckle up his *wallet* again!

8. *C* But in the same *advertisement* he says of you,

" His constant railing at the *Experiment* is a full testi-
" mony how hard that *plot* upon the *dissenters* pinches
" them, since I have challenged his party to bring their
" clamouring friends to a court of justice, where that
" matter can only be determined, and where it may fi-
" nally appear to the world, who are the *lyars* and *for-*
" *gerers*, his party or I?

R. This is a new way of ending a *paper-war!* we must go to *law* to know which *paper* is true! But who does he mean by *my party?* No doubt those who *answered* his *Experiment*. And then who are *their clamorous friends?* why even the very same; and he would have them go to *law* with one another!

C. If the *affidavits* and *certificates*, in the *answer* to the *Experiment*, be not true, there is *scandal* enough thrown upon *De Foe* and his *party*. And they pretty well know the *author*; let them bring their *action*, if they think themselves aggrieved. But to bid us go to *law* is *ridiculous*, and shews they have nothing to say for themselves.

9. *R.* The case standing thus, and they not being able to make any *reply* to that *answer*, they have fallen upon a *contrivance*, not to lose benefit of all that *scandal* cast upon the *church* in the *Experiment*, which being grown so *infamous* by its being so notoriously *detected* in the *answer*, and no *reply* made that they were forced to call it in, and let it appear no more; but last year they *printed* it again with a new *title*, and to appearance a new *book*. The new *title* is, *The Honesty and Sincerity of those worthy Gentlemen commonly called High-churchmen, exemplified in a modern Instance. Most humbly dedicated to her Majesty, and her High-Court of Parliament. London, printed and sold by Benj. Bragg, in Pater-noster Row*, 1707. I came

to know this by accident, for employing a friend to get the *Experiment* for me, and it not being to be heard of in any bookseller's shop, he got this from a gentleman, who assured him it was the *Experiment* word for word, only *disguised* with this new *title*.

Wednesday, Feb. 16, 1708. N°. 397.

---

1. So *hardened* a case as that of *reprinting* the *Experiment* is not to be parallelled.
2. Why the *clergyman* who prosecuted *Abraham Gill* chose to *answer* the *Experiment* instead of following the *law* any further.
3. The *Review* stands by the *Experiment* still, and tells how it *pinches*.
4. They repeat the *appeal* they made to *God* and the *queen* for the *truth* of every word of the *Experiment*.
5. And of the *least* and *minutest circumstance* in it.
6. How good *protestants* they are.
7. The *crime* is in the *dissenters* more than in *De Foe*.
8. Yet all the *dissenters* are not included herein.
9. The difference betwixt *prosecution* for *principles*, and on *personal* accounts.

1. *Coun.* THE *reprinting* the *Experiment* under a new *title*, of which you told me in your last, is a *discovery* truly! That this may pass for a *new book* of *slander* upon the *church*, to which no *answer* is made! Can such another instance be given, among any *party* of men, of what *denomination* soever, of such an inveterate *malice*, proof against *shame*, and all *conviction*; defying *repentance*, or *confessing* any mistake, though so plainly *detected* to their faces, that they have nothing to say —— Yet standing it out still —— Not giving back an *inch* —— *Heroes* of *slander*, who, though overcome, scorn to *yield!* —— And when all the world cries *shame* upon them, not to be *daunted* a bit; but put out the same

ſame *ſlander* again with a new *vizard*, that they might not know its *face!* And ſo let it ſpread its *poiſon* till *diſcovered* anew! And then, like a *high-way man*, it is but putting on another *coat* or *wig*, and he is another man, and to the ſame work again!

2. *R.* The *clergyman* who proſecuted *Abraham Gill*, (the *hero* of the *Experiment*) had almoſt ruined himſelf by that expenſive ſuit at law, ſupported by the *joint purſe* of the party againſt him, with a thouſand *tricks* and *vexations* to make him weary of it, which they effected; for he ſeeing no end of it, and being no longer able to ſupport the *charge*, he contented himſelf to lay open the whole cauſe in *print*, which he did in an *anſwer* to the *Experiment*, with ſuch undeniable *vouchers* as carry'd their own *conviction* along with them, ſo *plain* and *evident*, as that it was not poſſible to make any *reply*. And all that the *author* of the *Experiment* ſays to him in his *Reviews* is, to bid him go to *law* again!

C. This is owning himſelf *beaten* and *baffled* to the laſt degree! But I ſuppoſe he vouches his *Experiment* no more.

3. *R.* Yes, yes; he can hear a thouſand *convictions*, and not be out of *countenance!* In his *advertiſement* to his *Review* of the 3d inſtant, quoted in my laſt, he calls the *detection* of *Abraham Gill*, a plot of the *church* againſt the *diſſenters*, and ſays, that their (the *church*) *railing at the* Experiment *is a full teſtimony how hard it pinches them.*

C. This is beyond any thing ever I heard! The church *triumphs* in all the *lies*, *forgeries*, and *perjuries* in the *Experiment*, being ſo fully and clearly *detected* in the *anſwer* to it, as that no *reply* can be made; and is this a *full teſtimony* how hard it *pinches* them! but it *pinches* not the *diſſenters* nor *De Foe* we ſee! It would *pinch* any other *ſort* of *men* in the *world!*

4. *R.* But after it was thus fully and abſolutely *detected*, yet they abate not an ace of their *confidence*; but in the new *edition* of it under another *title*, they repeat the

ſame *impudent aſſurance* with which it vouched all theſe *lies* at the beginning, and *dedicate* them to the *queen* (modeſt men!) as a *party cauſe* betwixt the *church* and *diſſenters*, and is addreſſed to her *majeſty* in theſe words, among many others;

"They humbly ſubmit themſelves and their cauſe "to your majeſty's protection, imploring your royal "regard ſo far, and no farther, as every article advanc-"ed in their behalf in this book is poſitively and ex-"actly conformable to truth and direct meaning, being "at all times ready to come forth and confront, even in "your royal preſence, all the allegations to the con-"trary. Having thus publickly appealed to God and "your majeſty, they can no longer doubt either of the "bleſſing from above, or the protection and aſſiſtance of "your majeſty below."

C. Hold! hold! *maſter*. I profeſs it *chills* my *blood* to hear ſuch ſolemn *appeals* to *God*, to the *queen*, and to the *world*, preface in the *forging* of *holy orders*, falſe *af-fidavits*, and the moſt notorious *ſcene* of contrived *vil-lainy* againſt the *church* that I believe any age ever ſaw! And to have this *repeated* again, after all theſe things have been *detected* as with a *ſun-beam!*

5. *R.* And the ſame *aſſurance* is carried on quite through all the book. He ſays, p. 2. of the new edi-tion:

"And as I ſhould not have attempted this relation, had "I not had good and undoubted teſtimony of the truth "of every article; ſo I write with the greater aſſurance, "ſince I can frankly defy the moſt hardened advocate "of ſuch a wretched cauſe (*i. e.* of the *church*) to con-"front the leaſt or minuteſt circumſtance."

C. And yet there is not one *circumſtance* of the *ſtory* he tells, but what has been evidently proved to be *falſe!* Not through *miſinformation* or *miſtake*, but all one *ſtu-died*, *deliberate*, and *concerted lie!* Stood in with *oaths*, *ſubornations*, and *forgeries* till *detected*, and ſtill *ſtood in* and *repeated*, notwithſtanding of its being *detected!* And that they cannot *diſprove* one *circumſtance* of the *detection!*

6. *R.* Yet

6. *R.* Yet these are good *protestants!* And the best *friends* the *church* of *England* has — If you will *believe* them!

C. They may be as good *protestants* as they please — But I am sure they are no *Christians*, and there is something under their *human shape* will denominate them of some other *species*. And till they go to their *place* the *world* will never be quiet! The *church* may say with *David*, *I lie even among the children of men, that are set on fire, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword.*

7. *R.* These are the men that provoke my *indignation*; for *De Foe* is but their *clerk*. He does what he is bid, and *paid* for; and I must say, he serves them faithfully! For he takes all this *shame* upon himself, rather than tell who they are that gave him the *informations*, though he says he has their leave to do it; but he tells us they are the *dissenters*, and writes it in their *name*, and we need desire no more.

8. *C.* I am glad he does not tell their *names*, lest there should be any of my acquaintance among them; for I know several of them that are *honest well-meaning* men, and for whom I have a particular friendship, and who, I am persuaded, will not be carried away, through the prejudice of their education, to do any *base* or *unhandsome* thing.

R. Yes, *countryman*, there are such among them no doubt; and I can discourse with them freely, and give my reasons against the *validity* of their *ordinations* and *baptisms*, without their taking it ill, or, I dare say, wishing me any harm for it; and who, I believe, would screen me what in their power, if I were prosecuted for it, and *detest* those who would take that method. And it is for their sakes, in a great measure, that I take so much pains to lay open the proceedings of their *party*, that I may recover them, if I could, out of such ill company.

9. *C.* To answer *principles* with *prosecution* in a dispute, is giving up the *cause*; but an *action* of *scandal*

brought by a particular *man*, is as just as an *action* of *debt*, or to punish *thieves* and *robbers*; for a man's *reputation* is dearer to him than his *money*. Let Mr. *Review* lay this by till another time.

Saturday, Feb. 19, 1708. N° 398.

---

1. The *Observator*'s attempt to set my *creditors* upon me for *ante-diluvian debts*.
2. His putting me in the *News-papers* now for *treason*, as formerly for the *Memorial*.
3. He complains of the approbation the *Rehearsal* meets with.
4. His foolish *story* of tearing the *addresses* of the *lords*, and spreading the *Rehearsals* in their stead.
5. What *pains* he says he has taken to ruin the *Rehearsal* and its *author*.
6. He *arraigns* the *queen* and the *ministry*, and says, they put *Jacobites* into all *offices* throughout *England*.
7. My *charm* will not fit him.
8. He encourages the *pretender* to make a *second* invasion.

1 *Coun.* THE *Observator* and *Review* having tried all methods to do you a mischief, and solicited publickly and privately to render you obnoxious to the government, and putting it in the *News-papers*, that there were *warrants* of *high-treason* out against you, have taken another manner to distress you. The *Observator* of the 2d *instant*, Vol. VIII. N. 1. (he begins well) says, *That your party furnish you with money to pay your debts, when you are arrested, to prevent your falling into the hands of the law.*

R. If he can make that good in any one instance, I will allow him to be an *honest* man! And though he may suppose my *party* (as he calls them) would not tell, yet sure those who were so little my friends as to *arrest* me,

me, would not ſcruple to let it be known how, and from whom they received their *money*, and they have my free leave to tell. There is not a man in *England* (I declare it) whom I would aſk to be *bail* for me in an action of *debt*, or from whom I expect it, far leſs to pay *old debts* for me; for before the *flood*, when things were better with me, I fell into that good natured *folly* of being *bound*, and yet, all circumſtances conſidered, I might be partly excuſed; but I will trouble no body with my private affairs. Thoſe concerned know my caſe as well as I can tell them, that the *deluge* ſwept away what might have paid them; and they have patience with me, knowing that my *life* may pay them, but haſtning my *death* cannot; I have converſed freely with ſome of them, without any fear of trouble from them, and had their *friendſhip* never the leſs; for they knew me. And the *malice* of the *Obſervator* herein is ſo apparent, that I apprehend not any ill conſequence from it of what he intends.

2. And for his *News-papers*, it is not the firſt time I have taſted of his kindneſs that way. About three or four years ago he put it in the *Flying-poſt*, that I was taken up as *author* of the *Memorial of the church of* England, and had given a thouſand pound bail, &c. Of which I took notice in my *ſecond vol.* N. 102. ſo that this was *repeating* a *jeſt*, which among *wits* is *dull*. Such things as theſe have given that *paper* the name of the *Lying-poſt* all over the town.

3. *C.* He makes you a great man, *maſter*. He tells how you are *attended and careſſed by clubs of the faction*, as he calls them. And who are theſe? He ſays, *Thoſe that eat the queen's bread, bind up ſets of your Rehearſals, and diſperſe them, and carry it on by ſubſcription.*

R. This is good news to the *publiſher*, whom he told but lately, that the *Rehearſals* did not pay *paper* and *print*. He ſhould make his *ſtory* all of a piece; but why ſhould not they who *eat the queen's bread* encourage a *paper*, which would ſave her from the *coercion* of *Obſervators* and *Reviews*, and all the *mob* of the nation? For if thoſe

principles took place, they would not much longer have *bread* to *eat*.

4. *C.* He says, *they tear the addresses of the lords in publick houses, and spread Rehearsals in their stead.*

R. He should have said in *private* houses; for then he might bid us go *hunt* and find them out! But in *publick houses* sure it would be *known*; else how came it to be *known?* Therefore if he does not name the *place*, and prove this —— he must e'en go for what he is!

5. *C.* He says in the next words to his *countryman:*

"You and I can do no more than we have done, *Roger*, to warn those concerned to prevent such things, "and of the mischief done by that *paper*; but hitherto "without effect."

R. None of your fault, Mr. *Observator*, or of your *Roger*; for it must be owned you have taken true pains, since you could no longer *answer* that *paper*, to have it *suppressed*, and the *author* to suffer the pains of *high-treason*, for *teazing* your *heart* out, as he has done; for you know you are the *original* of *government*, from whom *queen* and *parliament* derive their *title*, and so the *highest treason* is against your *worship*, and your *brethren* of the *mob!* Our *sovereign lord* the *people!*

6. *C.* And he behaves himself accordingly with an *air* of *authority* (I assure you) above the *queen* and her *ministry*, and calls them to a severe account. He says in this same *Observator*, that *there is scarce an office in* England *where there are not* Jacobites, *or worse men employed!*

R. This is appealing to our *sovereign lord* the *people* indeed from the *queen* and her *ministry!* But he says *worse* men than *Jacobites*. Can any thing be *worse* than a *Jacobite?*

C. O, yes, he explains himself; he says he means those, who, when they take the *oaths*, bid *the devil go down with them*. And I *doubt not* (says he) *he enters into them with the oath, as he did* Judas *with the sop*.

R. This is a terrible *account* indeed! But he makes himself *judge* of those who he says take the *oaths* thus

unwillingly! And he will not allow the *queen* or her *ministry* to *judge* of this! By which he *arraigns* them to the *people*, either of very gross *ignorance*, or of being themselves in the *design*, and either way not fit to govern! If he could have found such an *insinuation* as this in all my *papers*, his *solicitations* against me would have had more success.

7. *C.* Where is now the *armour* of *proof* he says you have got, to creep through the *briars* as you do without a *scratch*, when *Observators* and *Reviews* have been *prosecuted*, *pillory'd*, *&c.* those good friends of the *government?* He certainly thinks you have a *charm*.

R. I have so, *countryman*.

C. Will you tell it me, *master?* The *Observator* and *Review* would give me a good deal for it.

R. It will not fit them, *countryman*.

C. Pray try, *master*! they will *squeeze* hard but they will make it fit them; for I fancy their *necks* do itch sometimes for all the *treasons* they vent, and their bold *arraigning* of the *government*.

R. My *charm* is but one *word*; that is, *innocence*. While you keep that about you no *harm* can touch you.

C. They will beat me (as they threaten to do you) if I should tell them such a *charm* as that, they would think I *affronted* them!

R. I told you it would not fit them — They may see what I trusted to as my *defence* against all their *malice* (which I foresaw when I first entered the *lists* with them) in the *motto* I put to my first volume, *Et me qui fidera fulcit*; and he has not failed me.

8. *C.* You are safe there, *master*; but the *Observator* and *Review* are both full of a second *invasion*; and they say your *papers* do promote it.

R. How! Because I preach *loyalty* and the *laws* of the *land!* Did *passive obedience* ever yet bring about a *revolution!* But if what the *Observator* says be true, that all *posts* are filled with *Jacobites*, *&c.* I leave it to all men to judge whether he or I do most encourage the

pretender to make a second *attempt?* If the *Observator* should at last be hanged for a *Jacobite!*

Wednesday, Feb. 32, 1708. N°. 399.

---

1. The *libel* of the *presbytery* of *Aberdeen* against Mr. *David Hedderweik*, 1708.
2. How the *dissenters* here would take it to be so used.
3. They always put something *scandalous* in their *libels* against the *clergy*, though but for *shew*.
4. They call it *superstition* to observe *Christmas*, or *kneel* at the *sacrament*.
5. They would neither give the *sacrament* to a *person* of *quality* in her *sickness*, nor give leave to an *episcopal clergyman* to do it, even when she was *dying*. They publickly *preach* against it.
6. Examples of private *baptisms*. The sad condition of the *episcopal people* in *Scotland* at this day.

1. " A copy of the *presbytery* of *Aberdeen* their *libel* a-
" gainst Mr. *David Hedderweik*, 1708.

" AT *Aberdeen* the 29th of *December* 1708 years: " The which day the *presbytery* of *Aberdeen* con- " sidering the information against Mr. *David Hedder-* " *weik*, intruder into the *college-kirk* of *old Aberdeen*, do " hereby authorize, warrand, and require you, *George* " *Forbes* and *Gilbert Anderson*, their officers in that part, " conjunctly and severally lawfully to summond the " said Mr. *David Hedderweik* to compear before them " in the *Session-house* of the *New-kirk* of *Aberdeen*, on " *Wednesday* the 26th of *January* next 1709 years, in " the hour of cause, peremptorie to answer for his " alledged unlawful intrusion into the said *kirk*, and " there using a forme of *liturgy* and *ceremonies* never " received nor practised by this church under any go- " vernment, and contrary to the purity of worship en-
" joined

" joined by the civil and ecclesiastical authority, and re-
" served to the people of this nation by an express ar-
" ticle of the union of the two kingdoms, as a funda-
" mental and essential condition of the said union. As
" also for his presuming to *baptize*, having no authority
" from this established church, and in *baptism* using the
" *sign* of the *cross*, a symbolical and significant *ceremony*,
" having no warrand in the word of God, and contrary
" to the acts and constitution of this church, and the
" laudable laws of the land. As also for his presuming
" to administer the sacrament of the *Lord's supper*, him-
" self and the people kneeling in the very act of receiv-
" ing, contrary to the example of *Christ* and his *apo-*
" *stles*; and for administring the said sacrament on *Sa-*
" *turday* the 25th of *December* last past, contrary to all
" scripture example, the practice of this and other re-
" formed churches, and from a *superstitious* respect to
" that day, as more holy than others. As also for his
" presuming, as is alledged, to celebrate the bond of
" *marriage* betwixt parties, he being an outed minister,
" and not authorised by law, and the established church
" of this nation; and therein contemning the esta-
" blished order of this church, and laws of the nation,
" particularly the act of parliament, *June* 28th, 1695,
" intituled, *Act against irregular baptisms and marriages*.
" And further, for his employing to preach with him,
" or for him, some pretended preachers, who had no
" authority from or within this church, pretending only
" a licence from some of the exauthorat *bishops* since
" they were exauthorat; and pray not for her majesty,
" nor her own government, as by law required. As
" also for his scandalous haunting of taverns and ale-
" houses, as is alledged, after ten of the clock at night,
" or other times of the day, not being on travel, nor for
" refreshment. Which being punishable in any of the
" lieges conform to the acts of parliament made thera-
" nent, is much more considerable, and very scandalous
" in any who pretend to be ministers of the gospel,
" with certification, &c.

" Ex-

" Extracted out of the records of the presbytery by
" me,

" Sic subscribitur,

" Rob. Gray, Cl. pr.

" *N. B.* The within mentioned Mr. *David Hedder-*
" *weik* has long ago taken all the *oaths* required by
" law, and constantly prays for the *queen*.

" Also that church he says prayers in is no *parish-*
" *church*, nor has any *stipend* belonging to it."

2. *C.* I thank you heartily for this, *master*. Will *Observator* and *Review* any longer deny, that the *episcopal clergy* in *Scotland* are prosecuted for *baptizing*, or celebrating the holy *sacrament* of the *Lord's supper?*

How would our *dissenters* here take it, if they were put in the *Bishop's court* for receiving the *sacrament*, or having their children *baptized*, or *marrying* by their own *teachers?* And yet how could they blame it, while they justify the same proceedings of their *brethren* in *Scotland*, now that they have got the *law* on their side? If they do right in this, it shews what the *church* ought to have done to them once upon a day!

3. But, *master*, here they put into this *libel* against Mr. *Hedderweik* his going to *taverns* and *ale-houses*, and not for *refreshment*. How do they know it was not for *refreshment?* If there had been any *intemperance* in the case, no doubt they would have laid it home upon him. And what they say, is only, *as it alledged*. This is a very lame business to ground a *libel* upon.

R. It was only for filling up; they never miss some such *scandal* or other in their *libels* against the *clergy*. It is no matter for *proving*, it sounds well! and they think will justify all their proceedings!

4. *C.* And how do they call it *superstition* to keep a day in memory of the *nativity* of our blessed *Lord!* And to receive the *sacrament* on that day, and *kneeling* too, *and in the very act!*

5. *R.* Hold, *countryman*, let us keep our observations upon this *libel* till another time; for I have some more of the same sort to tell you, which I have from an undoubted

doubted hand: A certain person of *quality* lately dead, when very ill, sent for the *presbyterian minister* of the *parish*, and desired to receive the holy *sacrament* from him. But he refused, saying, it was against the rules of the *kirk* to administer the *sacrament* in private; and at the same time he required her not to take it from Dr. *G—s*, an *episcopal clergyman*, of a *strict* and most *pious* life, as well as a *learned* man, who was then with her in the house; but he was deposed by the *general assembly*. A few day after my lady finding herself grow worse, desired her husband to send for the *presbyterian minister* of the *parish*, and try his interest with him, which his lordship did; but all in vain, though he was my lord's own *minister*. At length my *lady* finding *death* approach, and unwilling to leave the world without that blessed *viaticum*, did receive the holy *sacrament* at the hands of the *episcopal minister*, the *presbyterian teacher* protesting against it, and going off without taking leave. This made a great noise in that part of the country among the *brethren*, who thought it a matter of *general concern*, insomuch that the *presbytery* did appoint a *probationer*, whom his *lordship* and the *burgh* had called to be *minister* in that place, to preach publickly in the *church* a *sermon* against private administration of the *sacraments*, it being one of the *five articles* of *Perth*, condemned by the *general assembly* in the time of king *Charles* I. And I have heard of another *sermon* upon the same subject against private *baptism* in the *church* of *Paisly* by another *probationer*, as a test of his being well-affected to *presbytery*, in order to be preferred to a *vacant church* there. So that this seems to be the *characteristick* of the *presbyterians*, upon which they value themselves.

6. C. If *Ananias* had been a *presbyterian*, he would not have *baptized* St. *Paul* in his own private *lodging*, nor *Philip* the *eunuch* upon the *high-way*, nor St. *Paul* the *jaylor* in *prison*. But these men will neither do it themselves, nor let others do it. This is the *dog* in the *manger*, I have some neighbours of this kidney; but I am resolved to see them *hare-foot*, whether they have *hoofs* or *toes*.

O sad

O sad condition of the *episcopal* people in *Scotland* at this day! They cannot have their children *baptized*, though at the last *gasp!* Nor themselves have the comfort of the blessed *sacrament* when they are dying!

Saturday, Feb. 26, 1708. N° 400.

---

1. Why I did not sooner *answer* the *Review* as to the *succession* of *ordination*.
2. His instance of *Columba* out of *Bede* answered.
3. Of *exemptions*, and the *regulars*, who are *popish presbyterians*.
4. The *presbyterians* have no *precedents* but these *monks*. Yet that will not do.
5. If it did do to the utmost for which they bring it, they must still lose the *cause* by vast *odds*.
6. The *succession* of our *bishops* shewed.
7. The *schisms* and *anti-popes* in the *church* of *Rome* hurt not our *succession*; but ruins that of the *presbyterians*.

1. *Coun.* I Have been baited, *master*, to give an answer to the *Review* of the 13th of last month, Vol. V. N. 125. They tell me you have slipt it, because you cannot answer it. That the *Review* has called upon you for an *answer*, and you have given him none. They say, that he there clearly proves the *validity* of *ordination* by *presbyters* alone without a *bishop*. And if so, he has thrown you upon your back, as to the *validity* of their *baptisms*, or even as to their *schisms*. You may think as little as you please of his *arguments*; but he thinks them *invincible*, and his party cries, come *answer* them, *answer* them!

R. You have given the reason, *countryman*, why I did not answer them. I thought none so weak as to be imposed upon by them; but my province being to instruct the *ignorant*, and talk to you, *countrymen*, I will not refuse

fuſe to anſwer whatever you think material in that *Review*; therefore put your *objections*.

2. *C.* His whole ſtreſs is upon one *Bede*, an *Engliſh hiſtorian*, who tells of one *Columba*, an *Iriſhman*, who built a *monaſtery* at *Ardmagh* in *Ireland*; and then went over into *Scotland*, and built another there; and that his *diſciples* erected ſeveral other *monaſteries*: *Which I think* (ſays *Review*) *will include their being ordained by him, and yet he was no biſhop.*

R. The *Review* muſt *think* again. He fancies that all *monks* are *clergymen*; but he is much miſtaken. There are more *laymen* than *clergymen* in *monaſteries* at this day; but at firſt they were moſtly *laymen*, who led very *retired* lives, whence they were called *monks* from the *Greek* word μόνος, which ſignifies *alone*; becauſe they kept very little *company*. At laſt they came to be framed together into *fraternities*, but even then they went to the *pariſh-church* like other people for all *religious* duties. Till at laſt they obtained a *prieſt* of their own *order* to adminiſter the *ſacrament* to them, which ſhews they had none before that could do it. And the ſtory the *Review* tells from *Bede*, he places very early in the days of *monkery* in the year 565. So that *Columba* (like St. *Anthony* the original of *monkery*) might have erected *monaſteries* without ordaining any of them, or even ſo much as being *ordained* himſelf.

3. *C.* But the *Review* ſays, that in that little *iſland*, which was given to *Columba* in *Scotland* to build his *monaſtery* in, the *biſhops* were ſubject to him and his ſucceſſors, the *abbots* of that *monaſtery*.

R. So you may ſee in *Oxford* at this day the *biſhop* of the *dioceſe* ſit below the *vice-chancellor* in the *univerſity-church* of St. *Mary*; and the *univerſity* is *exempt* from his *juriſdiction*, which is a piece of *popery* we have not yet purged out; for there is no power upon earth can *exempt* any man from the *juriſdiction* of his *biſhop*. It is a ſort of *excommunication*; for St. *Ignatius* (*ad Magnes.*) deſcribes a *church* thus: *Your biſhop preſiding in the place of God, your preſbyters in the place of the council of the apoſtles, and your deacons intruſted with the miniſtry of*

Jeſus

Jesus Christ. Now where the *bishops* do not *preside*, it is a *church* those ages knew nothing of. But the *pope* setting up for *universal bishop*, broke into this frame of the *church*, and took upon him to make *exemptions* of what *persons* and *places* he thought fit from the *jurisdiction* of their respective *bishops*. And to break their power the more, he exceedingly encreased the number of the *regulars* (that is, *monks* of several *orders*) subject only to their own *superiors*, and ultimately to the *pope*. Therefore they are called his *life-guard*; for they support him as he does them. And he made use of them at the *council* of *Trent*, to have *episcopacy* declared not to be of *divine right*, except that only of the *apostolical chair*, as they call the see of *Rome*. And *Loonez*, the *general* of the *jesuits*, made an elaborate *oration* there upon this subject, which the *presbyterians* have copy'd, and not added much to it; for there you will find all their *arguments* against *episcopacy*. The *regulars* in the *church* of *Rome* are *popish presbyterians*; that is, live under *presbyters* without bishops; and our *presbyterians* are *protestant jesuits*, hold the same with them as to *episcopacy*, only differ about the *pope*.

4. What wonder is it then, to see a *monk* (for such was *Bede*) magnify his own *order*, and set it above *episcopacy*? Though he did not, only as to that little *island* where *Columba* had his *monastry*, as a particular *exemption*; yet he says nothing which infers, that these *presbyters* (if they were such) did *ordain* others of themselves without a bishop, as I have shewed; for if the *monks* came to the *parish-church* for the *sacrament*, till they had a *priest* granted them, who should give it them? it is not likely they thought they had a *power* inherent in themselves to confer *holy orders*.

5. But to let this *instance* go as far as possibly it can be carried, suppose that in this little *island* in *Scotland* they had been truly *presbyterians*, and to have continued so ever since the *sixth century*; would this *over-balance* the constant *practice* and *principle* of all the *churches* in the *world*, from the *apostles* time to this day? At least to

John

John Calvin at *Geneva* in the year 1541. (and a few since) though he then gave full attestation to *episcopacy*, only pleaded *necessity*; of which I have spoken sufficiently already.

C. I think this point is clear; and our *presbyterians* have none but *monks* and *regulars* (the most corrupt part of the *church* of *Rome*) to plead as *precedents* to them; and yet neither will these do.

But, *master*, he still desires you to shew the *succession* of our *bishops*.

6. *R.* I told it him long ago; but he would not mind it, that we have as clear a *succession* of our *bishops* as of our *kings*. I referred him to *Stow*'s *Survey* of *London* for the names of all the *bishops* of *London* from that time upwards as far as our *history* reaches, and from *Stow* to this present *bishop* of *London* it is well known. And if he will go abroad, he may see in *Eusebius* the *succession* of the great *bishopricks*; and there is a list of them at the end of Dr. *Cave*'s *Lives of the Fathers*.

7. *C.* But this *Review* goes further, and tells of *schisms* were in the *church* of *Rome*; two or three *popes* at a time, and these could not all be right, and he asks from which of these we derive our *succession*?

R. Suppose I say, from the same as the *presbyterians*; for he owns their *ordination*, as well as ours, to come from the *church* of *Rome*; and therefore he is as much obliged to answer this question as I am.

But that he may not think this a *put off*, I will give him a short *answer*: Though there was a dispute which of them was the right *pope*, yet none denied but they were all true *bishops*. And that is all we are concerned in as to the point of *ordination*. And they deny *ordination* by *presbyters* without a *bishop*. So whence the *presbyterians* will bring their *succession*, is left to the *Review* to consider; and I hope he will tell us.

Wednesday, March 2, 1708. N° 401.

1. A new *farce* begun.
2. The *Review* begins to *bully*.
3. The *Experiment* intended for a *part of a register*.
4. The *Review* begins a *dialogue* with the *Rehearsal*.
5. The *Review* owns himself *author* of the *Experiment*. His *proof* that it was not *re-printed*.
6. That Mr. *Skey* would tell the *names* he wou'dn't tell.
7. That the *affidavits*, &c. at Mr. *Skey*'s were not *forged*.
8. Nor the *letters of orders* from the *bishop* of *Chester*.
9. The *Rehearsal* yields the *victory* to the *Review*.
10. The *countryman* vapours.

1. *Reh.* YOU must be gone, *countryman*, here's the *Review* come to make me a visit; and he may be shy to talk before you.

C. Then, *master*, let me slink into a corner, and I'll only talk to my self, unless he comes to *beat* you, and then I will shew my *oaken towel*.

R. He'll say, that is foul play, to have a *second* hid in a corner. But he comes alone, so there's no danger.

[*Countryman* goes aside.]

2. (Enter) *Review* (with hat cocked) Sir, I thought the chastisement I gave you, in mine of the 3d last month, *Vol.* V. N. 134. p. 535. would have stopt your mouth; for I there told you, that I *my self* would have given you *personal correction* before this time, for your *scurrilous usage of me, had not your cloth protected you*.

R. No, Sir, it *protected* you—for you have had far the better of me as to *scurrilous usage*. And you gave me fair warning in your *Preface* to your *New Test of the Church of* England's *Honesty*, where you give caution not to pinch an *adversary* too close in an *argument*, because where the *tongue* fails, the *hands* go to work. But he that's

that's afraid of a f—t will never endure *a gun*. Therefore let me know, whether you come to employ your *hands* or your *tongue*.

3. *Rev.* my *tongue* ſhall ſerve for this time, for I have not done with it yet. I have made an *Experiment* of it once more in mine of the 19th laſt month, *Vol.* V. N. 141. wherein I think I have abſolutely *clinched* the matter, as to my *book* called the *Experiment*, wherein you ſeemed to *triumph* over me. But it was the beſt *book* ever I wrote, and intended to do moſt ſervice; and had done it, but for that pernicious *anſwer* came out to it. Who would have thought that *high-church* could have been at ſo much *pains!* But this is not only my *book*, but the *book* of the *party*, and ſet out as a *party-book*, wherein our whole *ſtrength* is ſummed up, and has coſt us no little pains; therefore we intend not to loſe it, but (whatever fate it has now) to tranſmit it to *poſterity*, where it may have good effect (when the *anſwer* will be dead and rotten) and ſerve as *A part of a Regiſter*, our *precious* book ſo called, and ſtill preſerved among us, of the like *pretty* things in the time of queen *Elizabeth*, and which *Calamy* at the end of the *Preface* to his *Abridgment of Baxter's Life*, ſets at the front of the *books* he recommends in defence of the honeſt *puritans* then, and our pious *diſſenters* now.

4. I have received ſome *rebukes* from our friends, for ſuffering you to expoſe this our *Experiment* as you have done. But you are witneſs for me, that I cou'dn't help it, and that I did my beſt! I *threatened* both with *tongue* and *hands*, and if that would not do, it was your fault—But now I have got a *topick* whereby to defend this *book*, which I believe you never thought of; and I promiſe for it, that it will ſtand *proof* againſt all you have to ſay to the end of the world! I have ſet it down at large in that ſame *Review* I named, *Num.* 141. and I am come now to diſcourſe it over with you, by way of *dialogue*, that I may have the pleaſure to ſee you *overcome* before my face! therefore now put what *objection* you can againſt the *Experiment*, and you ſhall ſee I'll

anſwer

answer it off-hand out of this *Review*, which I thus spread open before you upon the table.

5. *R.* The first thing I would know is, whether you own your self the *author* or *putter-together* of this *book* of the *Experiment!*

Rev. You see I own it here, p. 564. and say, *I see no reason to be ashamed to own it.*

R. Why then did you *re-print* it under another *title*, if you were not ashamed of it?

Rev. That's answered in the very next *sentence*, where I say, *This author* (that is, you, Sir) *belyes himself about it* (the Experiment) *every day. He says now it is re-printed word for word, it is but a little while ago he said in print, we had bought them all up, being ashamed they should be seen.*

R. That is, it was not to be had under the first *title* it bore, *viz.* the *Experiment*; for I'm sure I sent to several *booksellers*, and they said it was not to be had. And at the end of mine of the 12th last month, *Num.* 396. I told you the accident by which I came to know it was *re-printed* under another *title*. I set down the *new title* at large, that there might be no mistake, and by whom the *book* was *printed* and *sold*. And while this was fresh before your eyes, you wrote this *Review* of the 19th, but seven days after, and deny not one word of the *fact* that I told, but say *I belye my self every day!* And say, p. 562. *I firmly believe every tittle affirmed* (in the Experiment) *to be true.*

Rev. And isn't that enough! for surely he that *belyes himself every day* is not to be *believed!* And if I *firmly believe*, &c.

R. Do you yet object any thing against the *fact* that I have told?

Rev. Have I not *disproved* it already? I say *you belye your self every day*, and I believe every *tittle* in the *Experiment.*

R. And is this all the *answer* you will give?

Rev. Till it be *disproved*——I say, *you belye your self every day.*

6. *R.*

6. *R.* But what say you to my sending to Mr. *Skey* in *Thames-street*, as you had directed me to know the *names* of your *informers* about the *Experiment*, and you said he would tell them all, for that you had their leave, and they were not *ashamed* of it? But Mr. *Skey* would not tell one of their *names*, nor own that he was one of them.

Rev. Don't I say in this same *Review* here lying before us, here it is, p. 562. col. 2. that all the *vouchers*, *affidavits*, &c. are at Mr. *Skey*'s? And p. 564. col. 2. I say to you, *That you own I directed you to Mr.* Skey, *for the names of those concerned in the* Experiment?

R. But Mr. *Skey* wou'dn't tell one of their *names*.

Rev. But didn't I direct you to Mr. *Skey*?

R. Yes, I own it; but didn't you hear me, when I said he would tell none of their *names*?

Rev. But didn't I direct you to Mr. *Skey*?

R. This makes against you, since he would not tell.

Rev. But did'nt I direct you to Mr. *Skey*?

7. *R.* What say you then to the *affidavits*, *letters of orders*, &c. which the *answer* to the *Experiment* shews plainly were *forged*?

Rev. I say they are at Mr. *Skey*'s.

R. Does that shew they were not *forged*?

Rev. They are at Mr. *Skey*'s; and they were received by the *court*.

R. The *court* receives any *affidavits*, does that shew they were *true*?

Rev. The *court* did receive them.

R. But did that hinder the *detection* of them afterwards?

Rev. The *court* did receive them; you may go to *law* if you will.

R. I gave you very good reason why it was not worth while.

Rev. I say, go to *law*.

8. *R.* The *bishop* of *Chester* gave *certificates* that he never did ordain *Abraham Gill*, and caused them to be inserted in several *Gazettes*; and his *certificate* is uncontestable

testable at *law* in this case. So that we need not go to *law* to know the truth of this.

Rev. I say, go to *law*.

9. *R.* I confess your new *topick* of *argument* has *overcome* me! it is *unanswerable* to the end of the world; and far exceeds all that could ever have come into my dull *pate!* and I believe no man will henceforth be fond of entering the lists with you in *argument!*

10. *C.* (aside) this is a *gaudy day* with my *master*—— he has so *mumbled* the *Review*, that he'll hardly ever shew his *face* again; if I had worn my *oaken-towel* to the *stumps* upon him, it would not have *mortified* him half so much! for you have told every word of the *answers* he gives; and how *ridiculous* do they look out of his *furbuloes*.

Saturday, March 5, 1708. N° 402.

---

1. The *Review* not wronged in the last account I gave of him. He will not have it a *paper-war* that is betwixt him and me.
2. His *New Experiment*, that a *freeholder* of 40 s. a year may sit at home himself, and command his *master* of 10,000 *l.* a year to carry a *musket* for him to the *war*, or turn out of the *kingdom*.
3. The *countryman* acts this naturally.
4. The *Review* makes the *freeholders* the ultimate *judges* above *king* and *parliament*.
5. The *whigs* have the like *notion* of all other *kings*, and love to insult *crowned heads*.
6. If absolute *kings* were such as our *whigs* represent them, the late *insult* upon the *Muscovite ambassador* might cost us dear.
7. The *Observator*, *Review*, &c. chiefly *guilty* of that *insult*. The like no where but in *England*.

1. *Coun.* WE had pure company with the *Review* last time, *master*, I suppose you'll be troubled with no more of his company in haste! but he may

may ſay, that you may make any body *ridiculous* at this rate, if you can put what *anſwers* you pleaſe in his mouth.

R. I appeal to every one that has read our *papers*, whether I have not given his true and real *anſwers*, and all the *anſwers* he has given this twelvemonth paſt, or more, to my objections againſt his *Experiment*. When I ſhewed the plain *detection* of it in the *anſwer* to it, the forged *affidavits* and *letters of orders*, with the *biſhop*'s certificate that he never gave ſuch *orders*, &c. Had I any other *anſwer* from the *Review*, than that he ſtill believed every *tittle* in the *Experiment* to be *true!* that the *papers* with the *vouchers names* were left at Mr. *Skey*'s for every one to ſee that pleaſed, for that he had their free leave to tell their *names*. And when I replied, that if he had their leave to tell their *names*, why did he go about the buſh ſo? did he think every body through the nation that reads his paper muſt go to Mr. *Skey*'s to be ſatisfied? and that it looked ſuſpicious, he would not print them in his *papers*, ſince he ſays he had their leave. Yet all the *anſwer* was, that their *names* were at Mr. *Skey*'s. And when I at laſt told him I had ſent to Mr. *Skey*'s, and that he would not tell one of their *names*, I had nothing but the ſame *anſwer* from him, that they were at Mr. *Skey*'s! nor other *anſwer* could I get from him to this day.

C. Yes, he bids you go to *law*, for that this is not a *paper-war*.

R. What! not 'twixt him and me? Are we at *law?* And I gave him very good reaſon, I thought, why it was worth no other body's while to proſecute this matter any further at *law*. And all the anſwer he ſtill gives is, *Go to law*. And he has repeated this twenty times!

C. You have not wronged him indeed, *maſter*; this is all the *anſwer* he has given, or I believe ever will give. Though I fancy he'll be aſhamed to repeat theſe *anſwers* any more; and if he once comes to be *aſhamed* of any thing, there are hopes.

2. *R.* That we may not quit the *Review* abruptly (for he's a man of consideration, and I am about to take leave of him) I will give you a better *Experiment* of his, than this *Experiment* we have been upon. It is an *Experiment* of *argument*, and so will not cost us so much pains as the other. He cannot send us to Mr. *Skey*'s; and it is the great *cause* of *liberty* which he has so long maintained, and has now brought it to a most convincing *issue*. I'll give it you in his own words, it is in his of the 20th *January* last, Vol. V. N. 128, p. 511. where he says notably,

" Mutual defence is one of the least conditions the " Inhabitants can be required to contribute to the assist- " ance of their *lords* the *freeholders*, in case of need. " And on this foot it can be no oppression, if the free- " holders were driven to such an exigence, that they " commanded all the men in the nation to arms for the " defence of the whole, *except themselves*, and did not " suffer one of their body to stir a foot——He that " had but 40s. a year *terra firma*, has a right to stay " at home, and representatively considered, to com- " mand him that has ten thousand pounds a year in te- " nements, leases, copy-holds, fen-rents, interest on " bonds, *&c.* to take a musket and fight for him, or " to remove out of the kingdom."

3. *C.* I have 40 *shillings* a year in *terra firma*, and if I see a fine *coach* and *six* go by my door (where I sell a *pot* of good *ale*) with *gentlemen* and *lacqueys*, a power of them, on *horseback*, and may be a *furbulo'd-lady* or two in the *coach*, what signifies all that? May not I go out and stop the *coach* and say, Here, you Sir *duke*, *marquis*, *earl*, *judge*, *lawyer*, *usurer*, or whatever you be, you may have your *thousands* in *places*, *pensions*, *bonds*, and *bags*, but if you have not as much *terra firma* as I have, know I am your *lord*, and can *command* you to take a *musket*, and fight for me, and I stay at home my self, by vertue of my *prerogative!* therefore I say, *stop*, you and my *lady* there, and all your company, and soop up my *tub* of *ale*, or pay me for't, else I'll send a *warrant* to my

deputy my *representative*, to have you *pressed* for *Flanders*, or *Catalonia*, to keep the *enemy* far off, lest they invade my *terra firma*, whilst *Joan* and I *soak* our *noses* in my *hovel*, and send you our *natural-born-servants* and *subjects*, to see how you like the *frost* in *Germany*.

4. *R.* But the *Review* says, that you may do this only *in cases of need*, and *if the freeholders were driven to such an exigence.*

C. And who is *judge* of such an *exigence?* It would be a sad case indeed, if the *subjects* were *judges* over their *sovereigns!* I would not give a farthing then for all the power of our *sovereign lord* the *people!* What! shall *kings* and *parliaments*, who were made by the *people*, be *judges* over the *people!* the *Review* knows better things than to allow of that! In his *Vol.* II. N. 46. the 19th of *June*, 1705. he threatened the then *parliament*, to *open the magazine of original power* upon them, *of which* (says he) *the late revolution is a pattern*, making all that a *mob* business too! And in his of *June* 22, and 26, 1708, *Vol.* V. N. 37. and 39, he calls *Westminster-hall* a *tenement* of *Satan's*, gives up our *army* as a *donation* to the *devil*. And in his of the 16th the same *month*, N. 35. he supposes this same present *parliament* to be a *house* of *devils*, and *Satan* their *speaker*, and by all means to be *resisted* and not *obeyed* by the good *people* of *England*, as you have at large set forth in your N. 330, 331. therefore he makes the *people*, that is, the *freeholders*, to be the ultimate *judges* over their *representatives* in *parliament*, and all others whatsoever. *Kings* are nothing to them, they can tread upon *princes* like *mortar!*

5. *R.* And not only their own *kings*, but all other *kings* and *princes*; for who have not a regard for their own *king*, can never have for any other. They look upon them all as *invaders* of the *rights* of the *people*. This is the reason of their *rude* and *scurrilous* treatment of *crowned heads* in general, of which the *Observators* and *Reviews* are so full.

6. *C.* But the *Observator* of late has taken a great deal of pains to vindicate the *privilege* of foreign *am-*

baſſadors, on account of the late inſult upon the *ambaſſador* of his *Czariſh* majeſty.

R. That was only on account of the ill *conſequences* it might have produced. And if theſe abſolute *kings* were ſuch *monſters* as our *liberty-orators* have taken pains to *paint* them to the *people*, this might have coſt the *lives* of all the *Engliſh* in *Ruſſia*, and the loſs of that *trade* into the bargain, which yet we have not ſo free as ſome *neighbours*.

And in my opinion the *Obſervator*, who blames the action, was more guilty than the brutal hands that aſſaulted the *ambaſſador*.

C. How, maſter, would you bring in the *Obſervator* there too!

7. *R.* Yes, and the *Review* too, for theſe ſenſeleſs notions of *liberty* which they (among others) have blown into the heads of the *people*, of their being the *original* of *government*, and *ſuperior* to *kings* and *parliaments*, make them not only *inſolent* to their own *governors*, to all *quality* and *diſtinction* of men here at home, but likewiſe all over the world. Therefore you have not heard of ſuch treatment of *ambaſſadors* by any *people* as in *England!* Other *nations* have not the *thought*, they are bred up with a *reverence* for *crowned heads* and their *character*, which our *demagogues* call *ſlaviſh* principles, and unworhty a *free-born Engliſhman*.

Wed-

Wednesday, March 9, 1708. No. 403.

1. The *madness* of the *whig-principles* shewed from themselves.
2. They set the *son* above the *father*, and every *subject* above the *queen*. They make the *crown* but an *office*, and so inferior to every *freehold*.
3. The *Review* will not excuse the very *electors* of *parliament-men* from being *pressed*.
4. What would come on't, if all the *pot-walleners* were *pressed*.
5. His excusing the *terra firma* men would not mend our *constitution*.
6. He makes the *people judge* over the *parliament*, and the *parliament* over the *people!*
7. But in truth, *himself* and *every body judge* over both.
8. How the *consent* of the *people* saves every thing from *tyranny*.
9. The difference 'twixt the *bow string* and the *halter*.
10. The *advantage* of *rebelling* by *principle!*

1. *Coun.* YOU would never be able, *master*, to make these *whig-principles* so very *ridiculous*, but for themselves! When they comment upon them, they run themselves into such monstrous *absurdities*, that one cannot find a *greater*, by which to *disprove* them! as what you quoted last out of the *Review*, that a *footman* of but *two pounds* a year *freehold* may *command* his *master* of *ten thousand pounds* a *year* otherwise, to take a *musket* and *fight* for his *footman*, to preserve his *two pounds*, and that the *footman* need not be at the *pains* or *hazard* to *fight* for himself, but sit in *state*, and send his *master* to do it for him, or else order him *to remove out of the kingdom!* This is making *servants* the *masters*, and *masters* the *servants* with a witness! and dissolves all *rule* and *order* among *mankind!*

2. *R.* Yes, *countryman*, and if you ſhould buy but *two pounds* a year *terra firma* for your *ſon*, he might ſet a *muſket* upon your *ſhoulder*, or *command* you out of the *kingdom*, though you had *farms*, *houſes*, and *ſtock* upon your *grounds* worth 100,000 pounds.

Nay, I'll tell you more, *countryman*. Half an *acre* of ground near *London* would enable the *Review* (purſuant to his own *principles*) to tell the *queen* her ſelf, that he was her *lord* and *maſter*, and to ſet a *muſket* or a *knapſack* upon her *back*, or *command* her *to remove out of the kingdom*, for that ſhe has no *vote* in the *election* of *parliament-men*. Neither do the *whigs* allow her any *freehold*, only an *uſufructuary* poſſeſſion; for they ſay, that the *crown* is only an *office*, like that of a *judge*, *mayor*, &c. and *forfeitable* at the *pleaſure* of the *people*, as I have largely ſhewed before. And this is the reaſon given by the *Obſervator*, Vol. II. N. 25. why the *regal dignity can never be hereditary*, in flat oppoſition to the preſent *entail* of the *crown*. And the *Review* argues the ſame. See my *Vol.* I. N. 3. and 25.

C. Pray tell me no more of this fulſome *ſcheme* of *government*, it makes me *ſick!*

3. *R.* I muſt tell you one ſtroke more. He allows theſe ſame *electors*, of *parliament-men* to be themſelves *preſſed*, and ſent out of the *kingdom*, to carry *muſkets*, &c.

C. That's impoſſible! who ſhall *preſs* the *original* of *government*, thoſe that have power to *preſs* all others? and if they are ſent out of the *kingdom*, who ſhall *vote* in their place?

R. You will find it in the ſame *Review* we were upon laſt, *Vol.* V. N. 128. p. 510. where he finds fault with the late *act of parliament*, for *exempting ſuch as had votes in electing a member of parliament from being obliged to ſerve in the wars*. Which he ſays has cauſed a great *deficiency* in our *recruits*, for that in many *corporations* they chuſe by the *commonalty*, ſome by *pot-wallemers*, as they call 'em, and others the whole *freemen*, others again all the *inhabitants*, alms-men excepted. And theſe he thinks fitteſt to be ſent *abroad*, as not fit to ſtay at *home* among honeſt folks.

4. *C.*

4. *C.* A fair account of our *electors!* And is this the happy *constitution* he admires? But he would *mend* our *constitution!* and strikes at the very *foundation*, the right of the *people* to chuse their own *representatives!* but he would exclude all the *pot-walleners*, &c. and then I believe our *electors* would be reduced to a more rational number. But may not a *terra firma* man be a *pot-wallener*, especially such a poor rogue as has no more than 40 *shillings* a year, and would be glad to take a *pot* of *ale* from a *tinker?*

R. Yes, but these being the *original* of *government* must be excused.

5. *C.* A fine *original* of *government* indeed! And what's the matter who's the *original* of *government*, if they are *pot-walleners?* Is not one *pot-wallener* as good as another? Where's now the *salus populi*, the *publick good*, the *liberty* and *property*, and all the *glorious* things these *declaimers* for the *power* of the *people* would make us believe would follow from that noble *scheme* of *government!* that the *last resort* must be in such hands, as this same *Review* describes to be so scandalous as neither fit to *stay at home*, nor *go abroad* to the *war*, unless we would give up our *army* as a *donation* to the *devil*, which the *Review* does in those very words, as you have before quoted him. But who does he think has *authority* to send these *pot-electors* abroad, that the country might be rid of them?

R. He says the *parliament*; he would have an *act of parliament* for it.

6. *C.* How! can the *elected* put *muskets* upon their *electors*, and *force* them out of the *kingdom* into the mouth of a *cannon?* Might not some of them be of the opinion of Mr. *Review*, to raise the *magazine* of *original power* upon the *parliament* their *representatives*, who derive all their *authority* from these their *principals*, and *constituents* as our *liberty-men* speak! They make the *parliament* to be *judge* over the *people*, and the *people* back again to be *judge* over the *parliament!* This is such *stuff* of *contradiction* as cannot enter into any one of *common sense*.

7. *R.* The true meaning is, that every one of the *people*, (the *meanest* of them, whether he is worth a *penny* either in *land* or *money*, in *learning* or *sense*) is *judge* over both *people* and *parliament*; now to *halloo* the *people* upon the *parliament*, and then to stir up the *parliament* against the *people*, even their *electors*, to make *slaves* of them, and *force* them out of their native *country*, from their *wives* and *children*, without any provision made for them to carry *muskets* in *foreign* lands, and hang them as *deserters*, if they offer to return.

C. And this he calls *liberty* and *property*? Pray, what then does he call *tyranny* and *slavery*?

8. *R.* O, that is when it is done without your own *consent*.

C. Men need not be *pressed* if they did *consent*. We have had examples of some of them, who have cut off their own *fingers* or *toes*, and others who have *killed* themselves, rather than be *forced* out of their *country*, and undergo all the *servitude* of *war*. And did these *consent*?

R. Yes, by their *representatives* in *parliament*!

C. What! if they never had a *vote* in chusing *parliament-men*! which is the case of far the greatest part of the *nation*. Can a man *represent* me without my own *consent*?

9. *R.* Your *consent* is *implied*, because you said nothing against it!

C. If I should they would *hang* me; if I should declare against both *queen* and *parliament*, because I had no hand in *chusing* either of them! If this sort of *consent* be *liberty* and *property*, and the *rights* of *free-born Englishmen*, if this is the *choice* of the *people*, then the *Grand Seignior* is *elective*, and his *mutes* are the *freest* subjects in the world, for they do not *speak* at all. And if they did, he would only *strangle* them, as you say they would serve me, if I spoke my mind here. So that by this, the *bow-string* and the *halter* is all the difference betwixt the *liberties* of *Turks* and of *Englishmen*.

10. *R.*

10. *R.* No, for we can *rebel* by *principle!* which the *Turks* cannot. And this is all the advantage I know that flows from the *power* of the *people*, a *liberty* to *destroy* one another! and setting up every man a *judge* above the *government*.

Saturday, March 12, 1708. N° 404.

---

1. What a *fool* the *Observator* has made of *liberty*.
2. How the *Review* mends the matter, to prove *pressing* to be no *invasion* of *liberty*.
3. He makes some to be *slaves*, and some *freemen*, for the same thing.
4. The case of *ship-money*, and partiality of *Rushworth*.
5. The *remedy* for *ship-money* worse than the *disease*.
6. The *illegal* proceedings against the *king* upon it.
7. What the *whigs* get by bringing in these stories.
8. Of all *corporation-right* being granted by the *freeholders*.

1. *Coun.* THE silly *people* have been long dinned with *liberty* and *property*, and are at last put off with a mouthful of *moon-shine* by the *orators* for the power of the *people*. They have been hard put to it how to reconcile this *liberty* with *pressing* men to the *war*, putting them in *prison* to secure them, and forcing them out of the kingdom to face *cannon* much against their *stomachs!*

R. I remember *Tutchin Observator* found out a notable argument upon this head. He said that *imprisonment* did not take away *liberty*. Why? because a man in *prison* has *liberty* to walk about his room.

C. And if he were chained to a *post*, he had *liberty* to go the length of his *chain*——What a *fool* have they made of *liberty!*

2. *R.* But the *Review* of the 20th *January* last, Vol. V. N. 128. p. 511. has at last found out the true notion of *liberty*. He says, *Invasion of liberty seems to be*

prescribed, not to the degree of necessity, but to the right of judging——That is, who is *judge* when there is such a *necessity* as to make it requisite to restrain the *liberty* of the *people*, so as to levy *money* of them, and oblige them to bear *arms* for the defence of the nation. For thus he goes on and explains it;

" If the *prince* or the *general*, or even the *magistrates* " make themselves judges of this necessity, it is *illegal* " and *oppressive*. This was the case of *ship-money*, con- " demned by parliament, and by all the great lawyers " of the nation; the pretence was, *in case of necessary* " *defence*. Now the objection was not whether there " was a necessity or no, but whether the *king* was judge " of that necessity, and had authority to determine it, " and to levy the money without the consent of the " people?

And in this instance he thinks himself secure, and proceeds to his conclusion in the following words;

" Here all these disputes are taken away, the *people* " are the judges of their own necessity, and determine " in parliament, that such and such of their own body " shall, upon such and such encouragements, be ob- " liged to take arms to defend the rest; and as nothing " can be more equal than the appointment, so in our " constitution there can be nothing plainer, than that " this is perfectly clear of any invasion of *liberty*."

3. *C.* It is my turn to answer him now, for there is little difficulty in this case. His argument is, that it is no *invasion* of *liberty* which is done according to the *constitution*. Now in absolute *monarchies* he will not deny but the *prince* is *judge* of the *necessity*, and therefore that there is no *invasion* of *liberty* whatever he commands; and where there is no *invasion* of *liberty*, there is perfect *freedom*. Why then do we call other subjects *slaves*, and our selves the only *freemen!* If you see an *Englishman* that is *pressed* go like a *hang-dog*, and making *faces*, you cry, there goes a *freeman!* but if a *Frenchman sing* and *dance* under his *arms*, you say, that fellow is a perfect *slave!* and his *liberty* is *invaded!* O, what it is to be a free-born *Englishman!*

R. You

R. You have him right, *countryman*, and thus end all their dull and senseless *declamations* about *liberty!* they neither know what it is, or where to find it.

4. But I must say a word as to his instance of *ship-money*. There is a *gall* of *bitterness* in all these *whigs* against the memory of that glorious *martyr* king *Charles* I. They are not satisfied with his *blood!* they cannot let him rest in his *grave* after they have *murdered* him! Let the *Review* then know, that all the *judges* in *England* gave it under their hands, that the *king* was the only *judge* of the *necessity*, and therefore that the levying of *ship-money* was *legal*. I had in *manuscript* all the *arguments* as well of the *judges* in the *Exchequer-Chamber*, as of the *council* at the bar, on both sides, upon the case of *ship-money*. Two of the judges, *Hutton* and *Crook* (as I remember their names) did afterwards retract their opinions, and run in with the stream of the times. The arguments of these *two* against *ship-money* are inserted at large in *Rushworth*'s *Collections*, but not word of all the others that were for it; therefore I call him a *false historian*, for *concealing* the *truth* is giving *false evidence*; and an impartial *historian* should set down the *fact* on both sides, and let the *reader* judge. Thus too he dealt in the dispute betwixt *Abbot* and *Laud*, he gives us the defence which *Abbot* made, but not that of *Laud*. He plainly wrote on one side, he was *secretary* to *Fairfax*, and engaged in the *cause*.

5. But to return to the case of *ship-money*. From whom should the *king* know the *law* but from the *judges?* And the *parliament* that over-ruled the *judges* herein, were then engaged in a *rebellion* against the *king*, and took this for a handle. And how did they rectify it? They levied more *per month* upon the city of *London* than the *ship-money* came to in a year over the whole *nation*, and this without any *form* or colour of *law*. The *commons*, without *king* or *lords*, empowered *four* of their own number to value the *estates* of all but their own at what they thought fit, and to levy within the 20th part of it, to distrain by the *train-bands*, and for want

of ſufficient *diſtreſs*, to *compound* or *diſcharge* all *debts* due to the party; and if they ſuſpected he concealed any *debts* due to him, to *impriſon* him during pleaſure, and to *baniſh* his *wife* and *children* ſo many miles from *London*. My lord *Clarendon* in his *hiſtory* gives an account of this at large.

6. But now, to come to the utmoſt. Let us ſuppoſe that *ſhip-money* was *illegal*. What does the *law* direct in ſuch a caſe? The *law* ſays, *the king can do no wrong*, but his *miniſters* only are anſwerable. And, as *Bracton* ſays, the *king* ſhall be humbly ſupplicated to redreſs any *wrong* that is done. If he does, there's an end, and the *people* ought to be thankful. But even though he ſhould not, yet the *law* allows of no remedy by *coercion* or taking *arms* againſt him. But as *Bracton* ſays, *Sufficit ei pro pœna quod Deum expectet ultorem, nam ſuperiorem non habet in terris*; that it muſt be referred to *God*, for that the *king* has no *ſuperior* upon earth. Now ſee how it was in the caſe of *ſhip-money*. The *king* did redreſs it, and gave it up, upon the repreſentation of the *parliament*, and offered all ſecurity that the like ſhould be done no more. But this quieted not the *rebellion*; they clamoured upon it, after it was redreſſed, (as you ſee they do to this day) and would take no *ſecurity* but to pull the *crown* from his *head*, and to *ſecure* that act, to take his *head* from his *ſhoulders!*

7. *C.* How oft have you been reproved by the *Obſervator* and *Review* for mentioning any thing of the times of *forty-one?* They told you of the *act of oblivion* after the *reſtoration*, and that all theſe things ought to be *buried*; yet they never miſs an opportunity to ſtrike at the *church* and the *king* in thoſe *times!* And if you reply to them, they call you an *incendiary!* But as often as they call theſe things to mind, they do it to their coſt.

8. *R.* But what anſwer will you give to what is ſaid in the ſame *Review*, and the ſame *page* above quoted? *That all corporation-right is the grant of the freeholders, and conſequently all others*—that is, as he

words it, *whether supreme or subordinate*; whether the right of the *crown*, of *parliament*, &c.

C. Would he do us the favour to shew us one of these *grants* from the *freeholders*? All *charters* of *corporations* that we know of are from the *crown*. And the *crown* brings *quo warranto's* against them, by *law*, if they exceed the *powers* granted them in their *charters*; and it is the *crown* which grants power to *freeholders* of such a *value* to *vote*, and excludes others. Let him shew where the *freeholders* made this *regulation* among themselves; has he a *free-hood* to impose upon the *people* at this rate?

Wednesday, March 16, 1708. No. 405.

---

1. The right of the *people* given up, and some of the *freeholders* only made the *original* of *government*.
2. I talk with the *Review* for the benefit of others.
3. His *scheme* from the *nature* of the *thing*.
4. By *thing* he means *nothing*.
5. The *king* is the supreme *landlord*, and all *freeholders*, &c. derive their *right* from him.
6. *Kings* were before *freeholders*.
7. The *right* and *limitation* of *freeholders* in *voting* for *members* of *parliament* is only from the *crown*.
8. The *people* are *excluded*, and made absolute *slaves* by this new *scheme* of *government*.
9. Whether is better, *absolute kings*, or *absolute freeholders*.
10. More *liberty* and *property* now in *Russia* than in *Poland*.

1. *Coun.* YOU have peeled these *whig-principles* like an *onion*. First you strip off one *coat*, and then another, and another, till they have nothing left. They began with you upon the *independent state* of *nature*, and the *people* being the *original* of *government*. This was the old *whig* foundation, and carried on the *rebellion* of *forty-one*, and has been lately set up by

by Mr. *Lock* in his *Two Treatises of Government*. But you have taken him to pieces, and rendered that *scheme* so shamefully *ridiculous*, that even the *Review* has given it up. You have overthrown their pretended *facts*, and established your own upon such evident proof from holy *scripture*, that you have forced them to *blaspheme*, and disown the authority of *scripture*, calling them *dry Hebrew roots* and *withered branches*, and appealing from them to the *green boughs* of *nature!* But now the *Review* has set up another *original* of *government*, not all the *people* (for that he confesses will not hold) but only the *freeholders*. And he argues not from the *nature* of *government* or of the *people*, but from what he calls the *nature of the thing*, which I want to understand, for I know not what *thing* he means.

2. *R.* I would not have spent so much time with the *Review* for his own sake, but to save the unthinking *people* from being deluded by false *representations* of *government*, to seduce them into *rebellion*, and their own *destruction*; therefore I will not be weary to chase these *pretences*, till I have made an end of them. And because he sometimes complains of quoting him short, and mistaking his meaning, tell me what he says at full length, and I will give you an answer.

3. *C.* It is in his of the 20th *January* last, *Vol.* V. N. 128. p. 511. col. 2. these are his words;

" The *original* right of *government* is vested by the " nature of the thing in the *owners* of the *land*, whom " we call *freeholders*. All other *right*, all *tenure* of " *land*, all *grants*, *charters*, and *privileges*, whether *su-* " *preme* or *subordinate*, are *substituted* by, and conse- " quently *subjected* to this *right*. All *corporation-right* " is the *grant* of the *freeholders*, and consequently all " others—The *absolute dominion* then over all the other " inhabitants rests in the *freeholders*, and what they or- " dain as a *law*, the other, like *tenants* at *will*, ought " to submit to, or remove from the place; for the " other have the whole right to the *nation*, and these " cannot set their foot, but on the property of the for-

" mer.

" mer. He that will live in my house, shall live there " on my terms, or not live there at all; and 'tis no *op-* " *pression* in me to turn him out, if he either will not " agree to my conditions, or perform them when agreed " to. Mutual defence is one of the least conditions " the inhabitants can be required to contribute to the " assistance of their *lords* the *freeholders* in cases of need, " and on this foot it can be no *oppression*, if the *free-* " *holders* were driven to such an exigence, that they " commanded all the men in the nation to arms for the " defence of the whole, *except themselves*, and did not " suffer one of their own body to stir a foot."——

4. *R.* I have shewed the *nonsense* of this already. But how he infers this from what he calls the *nature of the thing*, or what *thing* he means, I cannot tell. Whether the *nature* of *government*, of the *people*, or of the *ground*, the *trees*, *rivers*, &c. And if he will shew how this *absolute dominion* of the *freeholders* follows from the *nature* of any of these *things*, he will oblige the world!

5. *C.* But pray, *master*, whence does a *freeholder* derive his right to the *land* that he possesses?

R. He holds of the lord of the *manor*, who holds of some other *lord paramount*, and so on till you come to the *king*.

C. Then the *king* is the supreme *landlord*.

R. Yes, *countryman*, all the *lands* in *England* did belong to the *crown*, and none has *title* to any *land* but what is derived from the *crown*; and we must pay the *king* a *fine* to have his leave to break the *intail* of our own *estates*, though we made them our selves.

C. Then why does the *Review* banter us with his pretended *original right* of the *freeholders*? their *right* is all *derivative*, and from the *crown* too; and yet he would make their *right* the *original* of the *crown*! but I suppose he will say there were *freeholders* before there were *kings*.

6. *R.* Let him shew that, he must find it among the *Pre-Adamites*; for the *dominion* of *Adam* was before the *property* of *Cain*.

7. *C.*

7. *C.* But how came all the *freeholders* to be excluded from *voting* for *representatives*, except those of such a *value?*

R. This too was from the *crown*. The *king* granted this *privilege* to such only as he thought fit; and none others have, or ever had, any such *privilege*.

C. If they had, it is not likely they would have parted with it, and have *excluded* themselves!

8. But what becomes of all the rest of the *people* besides the *freeholders?* they are much the *major* number; and though they have not *lands* to lose, yet they have what's as good, that is, *money*, *stocks*, &c. And have they no *property* in these, but at the *will* and *pleasure* of the *freeholders?* Have they no *lives* and *liberties* to lose? Is none a free-born *Englishman* but a *freeholder?* And have the *freeholders* of such a *value* an *absolute dominion* over the *lives*, *liberties*, and *properties* of the rest of the *freeholders*, and of all the *people?* Where then is all the *noise* we have heard of the *liberties* of *Englishmen*, that they cannot be *taxed* but by their own *consent*, nor any *law* made without it! and yet the lesser *freeholders*, and all the rest of the *people* have no *vote* in the *election* of *parliament-men*, nor did they ever intrust the other *freeholders* to *vote* for them; yet are they under the *absolute dominion* of these *freeholders!* Do we talk then any more against *absolute* government?

9. We are only against absolute *kings*, but not against absolute *freeholders*.

C. And which is the *best*, or the *worst?* that a *freeholder*, whom I can have to *clean* my *shoes*, should have an *absolute dominion* over me, or a *prince* nobly *born*, and who is used to *govern!* If I must be a *slave*, I would *serve* a *better* man than my self.

10. *R.* Every man has a *vote* in *Poland*, and it is a noble fertile *country*, there is perfect *liberty* and *property!* Now, *countryman*, whether would you rather at this day live in *Poland* or in *Russia*, a cold barren *country*, and the *king* is *absolute?*

C. But

C. But every one is *absolute* in *Poland*, the *Wisky's* and the *Ginksky's &c.* and they are cutting one another's throats! No, no, *Russia* for my money! I would venture the *Czar* rather than my *absolute neighbours!* I like not a *tyrant* at my doors. Since *absolute* must be, the fewer the better, better *one* than 10,000. And one that will keep down all the rest, who will let none wrong me but himself; and we must venture something under all *governments* and *administrations*.

Saturday, March 19, 1708. N° 406.

---

1. All hold of the *crown*.
2. The *crown* from *God* alone.
3. No *tenure* is *absolute* but the *crown*.
4. No *treason* against *parliament* or *people*, but only against the *crown*.
5. No *right* can be *supreme* but what is *unalienable* and *unforfeitable*.
6. That one word *forfeitable* determines the *original* of *government*, and explains our *laws*.
7. The men of the *Rights* make *God*'s power *forfeitable* to the *people*.
8. The *Review* calls *divine right divine tyranny*.
9. There can be no other *right* but *divine right*.
10. And this is the greatest *security* can be given to *men*.

1. *Coun.* THE attempt of the *Review* to place the *absolute dominion* in the *freeholders* has turned upon him far otherwise than he expected; for it has led us to the *king*, the *supreme* and *universal landlord* of the *nation*. And if right to *dominion*, follows right to the *land*; then it is plain, that all *dominion* is in the *crown*, and derived from it; because no man holds *lands* in *England* but from the *crown*, or from those to whom the *crown* has given those *lands*. And all still in dependance upon it, as in the case of *forfeitures*, of *escheats*, levying

vying a fine, &c. That as *rivers* come from the *ocean*, and run into it again; so all *authority* in the *subject*, or right to his *possessions*, flows from the *crown*, and returns into it again, as to its *source* and *original*.

But whence has the *king* his right to all the *land* in the *nation?*

2. *R.* From the first *grant* made to *Adam* of all the *earth*, before there was any other *man* in it but himself. So that the right of his *children* to their *proportions* must be *derived* from *him*. He had the original *property* in the *lands*, and *dominion* over their *persons* as soon as they were *born*, and he was the *supreme lord* of all the *men*, and all the *lands* in the *world*. And *kings* in their several *countries* succeed to the same *right*, as I have shewed at large in my *first Vol.* N. 55. and so on, where I have explained the *original* and *deduction* of *government* from *Adam*, as a *foundation* to all I had to say afterwards.

3. *C.* But however it was then, or many years after, yet now at this day in *England* has not every *freeholder* an *absolute right* to his *land?*

4. *R.* No; for that is not absolute which is *limited*, and whatever is *forfeitable* is *limited*; and there is not a *subject* in *England* but may *forfeit* both his *life* and *estate*.

C. That is, to the *laws*, to the *people*, or to the *freeholders*, according to Mr. *Review*, at least to their *representatives* in *parliament*.

R. No; to none of these. There is no *treason* but against the *crown*; and the *forfeitures* for *treason* are *all* to the *crown*. I cannot commit *treason* against the *parliament*, or the *people*, or the *freeholders*, nor can I *forfeit* my *land* to any of these. And the reason is, because I hold not my *land* of any of these; no man can *forfeit* his *land* but to him from whom he holds it. A *tenant* may *forfeit* to his *land-lord*, that *land-lord* to an higher *land-lord* from whom he holds, and the highest *land-lord* to the *king*, who is the supreme *land-lord* of all; for he holds in his own *right*, next immediately unto

to *God*, from whom he *derives*. And therefore his *right* is *unalienable* and *unforfeitable* to any but to *God* alone.

5. *C.* Then I will keep this as a sure *rule*, that nothing can be the *supreme right* but what is *unalienable* and *unforfeitable*. Therefore when the *Review* tells me of the *original* and *supreme right* of the *freeholders*, I will ask him if a *freeholder* can *forfeit* his *right?* And if so, (which he cannot deny) then it is plain, that his *right* is neither *original* nor *supreme*. And I will ask him again, to whom the *freeholder* does *forfeit?* If to an *higher land-lord*, then to whom that *higher land-lord* can *forfeit?* And so this brings us step by step to the *highest land-lord*, who can *forfeit* to none other but to *God*.

This is a *plain*, *clear*, and *easy* way to find out the *original* of *government*, and of all *human right*. It is going up *stairs* upon the *ladder* of *fact*. Here can be no *mistake*, or *quirks*, or *quillets* to confound a man's understanding.

6. And as you use to do, you have given it me in one *word*, I have but the word *forfeitable* to remember, and it brings all your *argument* into my mind. Is such a right *forfeitable?* And to whom is it *forfeitable?* This *clew* will lead me out of all the *mazes*, and through all the *mists* that the *whigs* raise about the *original* of *government*, and of *right* among *mankind*.

And it opens the *laws* likewise to me; there I see the *nature* and *chain* of *forfeitures* still to a *superior*, and last of all to the *king*, and there it stops. The *king* can *forfeit* to none. Our *laws* know no such thing as the *king*'s *forfeiting* his *crown*. Therefore, as you have often observed, the *convention* went upon *abdication*, but would not touch upon *forfeiture*.

And this leads us directly to *divine right*; all *right* is *forfeitable* to the *authority* that gave it. Thus all *civil authority* flowing from the *crown* is *forfeitable* to the *king*, and the *king*'s to *God* who gave it. And the *authority* of *God* alone remains *unalienable* and *unforfeitable* to any whatsoever.

7. *R.* One

7. *R.* One would think so; yet the men of the *Rights* deny it, and say, that as *God* derives his *authority* over us from the *people*, so his *authority* is *forfeitable* to them. The *Second Defence* of the *book* of the *Rights* says plainly, that as the *people* did *vote God* to be their *king*, so they *unvoted* him again, and after that he was no more their *king*.

C. Is this *possible?* Such hideous *blasphemy* calls for *fire* and *brimstone!* It *frights* me!

8. *R.* I undertake to make good this charge, even *literally*; which I will shew you when I come to take that *book* to task again, which I intend very soon; but for the present I will lead you through the like *track* that runs among the *herd*. The *Review* has been upon it long ago. In his Vol. II. N. 82. *Sept.* 11, 1705. he is not afraid to argue expressly against *divine right*, and calls it *divine tyranny*, p. 327.

C. He must only mean the false *pretence* to it.

R. He says, that all the *pretences* that are to it in the world are *false pretences*.

C. That indeed is destroying all *divine right* out of the world.

9. *R.* And if there is no *divine right*, there is no *human right*, as I have shewed you; for that all *right* is *derivative* but *God's*. We must hold of some or other, till we come to the first *giver*, which is *God*. And how *right* is *derived* from one to another, is known by what I have said of *forfeitures*; for none can *forfeit* but to him from whom he holds.

C. Has none then any *divine right* but the *king*, who holds immediately from *God?*

10. *R.* Yes, *countryman*. All *right* is *divine right*, and there can be none other; because *God* is the only *fountain* of all *right* and *authority*. But he has made some *subordinate* to others; yet so, that if the *superior* shall *unjustly* take away the *right* of the *inferior*, he is answerable to *God* the *supreme Judge*; which is the highest *security* can be given to *men* upon earth; for to let the *inferior* seek remedy at his own hands, would destroy all *government* from

from off the face of the earth, and bring in an *universal* and *unremediable anarchy* and endless *confusion*. It would dissolve the *frame* of the *world*, and turn all into its original *chaos*.

Wednesday, March 23, 1708. N° 407.

---

1. I have asserted *liberty* and *property* higher than the *whigs*,
2. They usurp the *prerogative* of *God* in *coercing* of *kings*, and *balancing* the *nations*.
3. They subject God himself to the *people*.
4. They renounce all *divine right*, and set *human* above it.
5. They make *God* a *tyrant*, and *Moses*, and all who claim *divine right*.
6. The short issue is, for *God*, or for *Belial*.
7. The *devilish liberty* they set up; and the *liberty* proclaimed, *Jer.* xxxiv.
8. The *Belial* government as *arbitrary* as *God*'s.
9. Searching to the *original* the true method.
10. *Common-wealths* more *arbitrary* than *monarchies*; and the then *parliament* than king *Charles* I.
11. Our *whigs* are for resisting *parliaments* as well as *kings*.
12. They are a *dog* in a *wheel*.

1. *Coun.* I know none has carried *liberty* and *property* so *high* as you, *master*. Yet you are thought to write against *liberty*, and for *slavish* principles, as *Observators* and *Reviews* would have us believe. You have given every man even a *divine right* in his *possessions*, and even against the *king* himself, insomuch that if the *king* invade my *liberty* or *property* unjustly, he makes himself obnoxious to the just judgment of *God*, as *Ahab* when he took *Naboth*'s vineyard from him.

2. *R.* But

2. *R.* But *whigs* will leave nothing to the judgment of *God!* They think there is no *security* in that! But every one of them would be *God* himself, and have the *government* of the *world* in his own hands! Not only to be *judge* over his own *king*, but over all the *kings* in the earth, to take from one, and give to another, and to *balance* the *nations*, as he thinks most convenient, without regard to *laws*, or *justice*, or any *divine right* in any but himself.

3. *C.* Nay, as you have shewed me in your last, they will not let *God* himself have *divine right*, but make him *derive* all the *authority* he has over us from the choice of the *people*, and that as they gave it him, they can take it from him again: So that he holds his *kingship* at their mere *will* and *pleasure!* This is the doctrine of the so *celebrated book* of the *Rights!* which is now become the *text* of the *whigs* to pull down *monarchy* and the *hierarchy*.

4. *R.* They have fairly turned the tables upon me; I said, there is no *right* but *divine right*: they answer, there is no *right* but *human right*; for that the *right* of *God* himself is *derived* from the *people!* I said, that all *power* is *forfeitable* to its *original*, and so thought to have proved, that *God* was the *original* of *government*. But they return upon me, that the *power* of *God* is *forfeitable* to the *people*, and therefore that they are the *original!* I said, that the *service* of *God* was perfect *freedom*. No, say they, *divine right* is *divine tyranny!*

5. *C.* That is, if *God* pretends to any *power* over us but what he *derives* from the *people*, he is a *tyrant!* And all who pretend to *divine right* are *tyrants* under him! Thus *Moses* (says the *Review*, Vol. II. N. 82. p. 326.) *governed the children of Israel by immediate divine authority, and when he found them fallen into idolatry, he falls upon them with the arbitrary sword of power, and killed* 30000 *of them for the fault.*

R. He has added a *cypher*, to make the *tyranny* the greater; for it was but about 3000, *Exod.* xxxii. 28. And the *Levites* were the *executioners*; and it was called *consecrating*

secrating themselves to the *Lord*. O these bloody *priests!* And this is the end of their *consecrations!* Therefore the men of the *Rights* will have none of them. True sons of *liberty*, that is, of *Belial*.

6. *C.* The reason given in this *Review*, p. 326. against *divine right* in *governors* is this, *that their title being divine in its original, must be uncontroulable in its execution. This prince holding immediately from God, is unaccountable, absolute, and arbitrary; and that's a tyrant.* And this he exemplifies in *Moses*, as before quoted, and says, p. 327. *the consequence of divine right is divine tyranny.*

R. Then these men are for the *right authority* or *government*, that is *divine* in its *original*. And if men *derive* not their *right* from *God*, it is easy to know whence they *derive* it. There is but one *choice* more, that is, the *devil*. So that our dispute is brought to a short *issue*; that is, for *God*, or for *Belial* the god of *liberty*.

7. *C.* A devilish *liberty*, which is perfect *slavery!* as the *service* of *God* is *perfect freedom*; but he that will not serve *God* must serve the *devil*. And the *liberty* that *Belial* gives, is a *liberty* to *bite*, and *devour*, and *destroy* one another, by dissolving the *foundation* of *government*, and letting men loose upon one another. And they must be strangely *possessed* with *Belial*, who take this to be *liberty!* who think *civil war* (the natural effect of *rebellion*) and the destruction of the *country* (which that produces) and the *famine* that follows that, and the *pestilence*, the common product of *famine* —— who think all these to be a glorious *liberty!* As now in *Poland*, which has felt all these *severely*, yet still persists in the *liberty* that occasioned them!

R. To such true *sons* of *Belial*, and *assertors* of *liberty*, it is said by *God*, Jer. xxxiv. 17. *Behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine.* This has been loudly *proclaimed* in *Poland*; O that it may be never more in *England!*

8. *C.* But now to see how *Belial* has cheated them, as the *devil* always does in the bargains he makes with us. He persuades men not to submit to *divine right*, because

cause it must be *arbitrary* and *unaccountable*; and yet all the *governments* that he sets up in its place are equally *arbitrary* and *unaccountable*. And all the *wit* in his *head* cannot help it; for there can be no *government* where there is not a *last resort*; and wherever that is, in *one* or in *more*, it must be *arbitrary* and *unaccountable*, else it is not the *last resort*. So that the *state* of the *case* is plainly this, we are all for *arbitrary government*; for there can be none other. The *jure-divino* men are for that which is *divine* in its *original*; but the *whigs* will have none such to *reign* over them!

9. *R.* If they will not have that which is *divine*, they must have that which is *diabolical* in its *original*. Let them shew then the *original* of that *frame* of *government* they would set up, that we may see how it *began*, whether by *rebellion*, or *usurpation*, or by the *institution* of *God*. This is the true way to determine the controversy, and this is the method I have taken, to search up to the *original*. And I have done it so far as to bring the *Review* to declaim against *monarchy* for that very reason, because it is *divine* in its *original*.

10. *C.* And for the *arbitrary* they are afraid of, you have shewed before, Vol. II. N. 70. §. 4, 5. That *common-wealths* are *arbitrary* of *arbitraries*, far beyond any *monarchy* that ever was in the world; destroying their *deliverers*, even by the necessity of their *constitution*, and uncapable of *mercy*; and are praised even for *that*; while *monarchs* are exclaimed against for their want of *mercy*; and also because they shew *mercy*, which is then called a breach of *justice*!

R. Let any one read the history of *forty-one*, and see whether the *parliament* then were not a thousand times more *arbitrary* than the *king*, levying *money* without *law*, invading *lives*, *liberty*, and *property* in the most *tyrannical* manner, without any regard to the *laws* or *constitution*! Their little *finger* was *heavier* than the *loins* of the *king*, and if he scourged the *people* with *rods*, they did it with *scorpions*!

C. 11. But

11. *C.* But our just and generous *whigs* abhor *tyranny* in *parliaments*, as well as in *kings*; as the *Review* says, *tyranny* in any *shape* is to be *resisted*. And he supposes a *house* of *commons* or *lords* may be a *house* of *tories*; that is, says he, a *house* of *devils*, and *Satan* their *speaker*. And that the *magazine* of *original power* of the *mob* ought to be raised up against them; and you see how free he makes with the *parliament* now in the case of the *bankrupts*.

12. *R.* These are the *high-fliers* of *liberty* against *parliaments*, as well as *kings*. They would be absolutely free *without any yoke*, which is the *English* of the word *Belial*. But they are the most *fooled by* him of any; he leads them into perfect *anarchy* in quest of *liberty!* They make every man *judge* of the *government*; they are now for the *lords* against the *commons*, then for the *commons* against the *lords*; and then again for the *people* against *both*; and again for the *parliament* against the *people*, to press even their *electors*, and send them to the *wars!* This is the *circle* of *liberty*, the *wheel* of *Belial*, wherein he puts these *turn-spits* to *roast* the *people!* They are always climbing the *wheel*, which turns under them, and when they have *done*, they are just in the self same *place* where they *began!*

C. And they say to the *pig* upon the *spit*, is not this better than that the *king* should *yoke* you, or put a *ring* in your *nose!* And it *squeaks* all the while, *patriots! patriots! liberty! property!*

Saturday, March 26, 1709. N° 408.

1. The *image* of *whiggism* given in my last shewed to be just.
2. A short history of that great *tyrant* liberty.
3. All the *governments* in the world are his *prey*.
4. He makes every *constitution* to be *tyranny*, as well as the *administration*.
5. With a *non obstante* to *jure divino*.
6. The *Review* diligently avoids the *argument*.
7. Which he *maliciously* says is *unseasonable* as to the *queen*.
8. He denies her *title* by *proximity* of *blood*.
9. He makes the *parliament sacred*, and *superior* to her.
10. He makes every *king* or *queen* a *tyrant* who govern according to *law*. And how he has *enlightened* England.

1. *Coun.* YOU have *roasted* the *whigs*, *master*; but they say it was not proper to make a *pig* speak upon the *spit*.

R. I only made her *squeak* —— But as to the *image* I there gave of the *whigs*, I appeal to every body whether it was not just in every part? Do we not see it now before our eyes? How long has *Poland* been *roasted* betwixt the two *fires* of *liberty* and *property*? Basted with the *liberty* to the *sword*, to the *famine*, and to the *pestilence*; and yet don't she still cry *liberty*!

2. *C.* Here's a *tyrant* for you! The more he *destroys*, the more we are in love with him! What *havock* has *liberty* made in the world! He first raised a *civil war* in *heaven* against the government of an absolute *king*, and was there called *Belial*. He preached *liberty* to *Adam* and *Eve*, and ruined their whole *posterity*. He opened his *mouth*, and swallowed *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, with all their *families*, quick into *hell*. He divided the twelve

twelve *tribes*, made them *destroy* one another, and at last become a prey to their *enemies*. He made a *slaughter-house* of *Greece* and *Rome* for many ages. And what *nation* has not been *devoured* by him! *York* and *Lancaster*, *forty-one*, *&c.* are all the glories of his *reign!* He now *triumphs* in *Poland*, and is shaking the noble city of *Hamburgh* in pieces. Wherever he comes, he brings *ruin* and *desolation* along with him! He has more than once set *England* in a *flame*; and quenched her in her own *blood!* And his *orators* are now at work among us, to justify his *proceedings*, to maintain his *title*, and to praise his *clemency!*

3. *R.* It is *insatiable!* He is never weary to *devour!* Nor can ever want *pretence!* For he has set down this *maxim* in the *Review*, Vol. II. p. 327. that *absolute rule must be tyrannical.* This reaches all the *governments* that ever were in the world, or that ever can be; for there can be none where there is not *absolute rule* in some hands or other. And this must be *destroyed* wherever it is; that is, all and every *government*, of what sort soever, upon the face of all the *earth!* and whatever can be set up in its place!

4. *C.* The *tyranny* of *government* used heretofore to be put upon the *administration*; but now it is upon the *constitution*, even though it be appointed immediately by *God*; for thus he says, *ibid.* p. 326. *A prince holding immediately from God is unaccountable, absolute, and arbitrary.* Then he adds, *and that's a tyrant*; and he instances in *Moses*, as you have before quoted him. This is *Dathan* and *Abiram* speaking to us again out of the *pit!*

5. *R.* And to include all cases, and to answer them all, he asserts this with a *non obstante*, p. 327. *Let government be never so sacred, and the line of governors jure divino*——Yet notwithstanding of *sacred* and *jure divino*, he says such *governors* ought to be *resisted*; nay, the rather for their being *jure divino*, because then they must be *unaccountable*, and that is, says he, being *tyrants*.

C. There is a full *answer* to all you have said of the *original* and *deduction* of *government!* Make them to be

jure divino again——— He makes them to be the *worse* for that, and more *resistable!*

R. And he will rather *rave* and *blaspheme* at this rate, than undertake to answer my arguments, and the clear *evidence* from *scripture*, *reason*, and the *laws* of the *land!*

6. *C.* But he says, p. 328. *I diligently avoid descending to argument.*

R. He had reason——— But does he think, that his *avoiding* will gain the *victory* to his *cause?* Then he that *runs away*, and first *avoids* the *field*, is the *conqueror!*

C. He says, *If I should grant governors as sacred as government, and the inherent right in all its extent as it is proposed, the matter would not differ here.*

R. Wherein then would it differ?

7. *C.* He says, *The question before me is, why this matter is now debated? And how it can suit with any man's duty to the queen? &c.*

7. *R.* The matter is debated now, because there are a company of *traiterous* and *disloyal* subjects, such as *Review*, *Observator*, *&c.* who *preach* up *coercion* against the *queen*, and put it in the power of the *people* to despoil her, not only of her *crown* and *dignity*, but of her *life* too, if they think fit. And does it not suit very well with any man's duty to the *queen*, to endeavour to preserve her from such *rebels* and *cut-throats*, and to beat down such *principles* as justify all this, and *poison* the *people?* One would think this a very acceptable service to her *majesty*.

8. *C.* He has something under his thumb which he dare not express! He strikes indirectly at her majesty's *title*, and denies her right by *proximity* of *blood*. He says, *We all acknowledge her to reign by the sacred authority of parliamentary limitation.*

R. The *parliament* does *recognize* her *title*; but does it deny her *proximity* of *blood?* Does the *Review* deny it? Did not the loyal *addresses* of the *nation* upon her *accession* generally *acknowledge* it, and *congratulate* her upon her *inheriting* the *throne* of her *ancestors?*

9. *C.* There you have him ——— Let him ſpeak againſt it if he dare! But, *maſter*, how comes he to give the *parliament* the title of *ſacred?* Do they give that *title* to themſelves?

R. No, *countryman*, that *title* is given only to thoſe who hold *immediately* from *God*; therefore it is given to the *king* or *queen*: but the *parliament* derive all their *authority* from the *crown*, and ſtile themſelves his or her *majeſty*'s moſt *dutiful and loyal ſubjects*.

10. *C.* Then his meaning was to ſet the *parliament* above the *king*, and to place them *next* and *immediately* under *God*; for his next words are: *Which parliamentary limitation is the ſupreme authority of this nation; all power that pretends to ſuperſede it is tyrannical.*

R. If he means that the *parliament* is the *ſupreme authority* without the *king*, he ſpeaks *treaſon*; and he makes every *king* or *queen* a *tyrant*, who pretend to any *authority* over the *parliament*; that is, any *king* or *queen* who ſhall govern according to the *law* of *England*; for the *law* acknowledges great *authority* in the *king* over the *parliament*, calls him the *head*, the *beginning*, and *end* of *parliaments*. He gives them *being* by his *writ*, and *diſſolves* them at his pleaſure.

C. Then any *king* or *queen* who exerciſes this *authority* is a *tyrant* with the *Review*, and men of his *principles*. And of ſuch a *king* or *queen* he ſays, p. 327. *No nation under heaven, that had two grains of reaſon in its exerciſe, could bear a tyrant, much more this enlightened people of* England.

R. He has *enlightened* the *people* of *England* to bear with no *king* or *queen* whatſoever; with none who have any *right* from *God*, or *authority* over the *parliament*, or indeed over any of the *people!* He would dethrone *God*, and ſet up *Belial*.

THE *Rehearsal* must have *Prologue* and *Epilogue*. Now besides the *weekly papers* which gave occasion to this work, of which you have an account in the *Preface*, this is to tell the reader that there are several *books* answered in these *Rehearsals*; such *books* as deserved not *books* to be wrote in answer to them, though some of them of large *bulk*, but the *sense* and the *argument* very *little*, and might be come at and *detected* in a few of these *papers*, without more *pains* than they were *worth*, and perhaps more *plain* to the reader too, especially among the common people, when the *false coin* was picked out, and shewed them by it self, without putting them to the trouble to tell over large *bags*, and where the *brass* money might escape them among the *good*. For example, when among all the *flourish* and *pageantry* of the *book* of *the Rights*, the whole *scheme* and *argument* of it is shewed to be the making the *power* and *authority* not only of *kings* and *priests*, but of *God* himself *derivative* from the *people*; and that without the *one* he could not maintain the *other*, since if *kings* and *priests* do *derive* their *power* from *God* (as is most apparent, both from *scripture* and *reason*) there is no way to bring them under the *people*, but by bringing *God* himself under the *people!* which this *book* of the *Rights* endeavours to do by what he calls the *Horeb-contract*. And the *dispute* being reduced to this *issue*, what man is there so *silly*, so destitute of common *sense*, as to need any further *conviction* of the *nonsense* of this *book*, as well as the hideous *blasphemy!* And by what is said of it in these *papers*, if we can maintain the *authority* of *God* over the *people*, the authority of *kings* and *priests* will necessarily follow, as *derived* from *him*. And in this I will commend the book of the *Rights*, that it speaks out what others meant, and has set the *cause* upon the right *bottom*, and justified what I always said, that it was the *authority* of *God*, which was battled in all the lewd *harangues* against *monarchy* and the *priesthood*. The pains we were at before was to shew them that this was the *consequence* of their *principles*. But now it is owned in express *terms*. And while the *authority* of *God* subsists, that also of *kings* and *priests* must hold,

being

being (as indeed it is) his *authority* derived to men; so that the *Rights* has effectually *established* what it meant to *overthrow*, and has left us now only to maintain the *authority* of *God*.

In like manner I have dealt with Dr. *Coward*'s several large *books*, concerning the *death* of the *soul* with the *body*, the greatest part of which are *pickeering*, and playing with *philosophy*, which it is not worth the while to answer; and if answered from point to point, would make a *volume* tedious to be read, and the *cause* might be lost in the *wood*, whilst many *topicks* are used that are foreign to the matter, and unintelligible to common readers. But I have made him speak *English*, and reduced him to the holy *scriptures*, which only can determine the dispute.

Thus Mr. *Asgill*'s book, Dr. *Edwards*, and Mr. *Hoadly*, their *sermons*, and other loose *pamphlets* are here taken to task, whose *merit* would not bear each a distinct *treatise*.

Here you will find *Arrianism* and *Deism*, *Socinianism* and *Popery*, treated of, besides our several sorts of *dissenters*, and other loose *principles* peculiar to this age. You will see here *church-popery* and *state-popery* maintained by those who cry out against *popery!* and *Christianity* defended by those who are against all *revealed* religion! You will see those set up for *protestants* who reject the *Creed!* The best *subjects* to be *king-killers* and *deposers!* and many other *strange* things!

So that upon the whole, these may be called *news-books* or *papers*. Not as *Observators* and *Reviews*, which spend their wise *verdict* upon all transactions of *state*, and censure the conduct of *princes* and *ministers*, but to warn people from the daily new *heresies* and *impieties* that come to town, in various shapes, and are recommended to them in *prints* of all sorts, to undermine *religion*, and debauch their *principles*; and I have given such *antidotes* as are in my power. This is the *watch* that is fallen to my share, and where I keep my *stand*.

The effect of the ruin of the *church* and the *monarchy* in the times of *schism* and *rebellion*, from 1640 to 1660,

was a deluge of *enthusiasm*, which in these 20 years time made a miserable *spectacle* of these three nations, filling them with Hydra *heresies*, and many *sects* of *religions*. But these 20 years last past *atheism* has appeared barefaced, and the *war* is carried on, with the help of the confederate *sects*, against all *religion* in general, and open *blasphemy* has succeeded *hypocrisy*. The one often follows the other; so we have mended the matter! for there is a *progress* in *wickedness*, as well as in *virtue*; and the oftener either is *repeated*, it grows the *stronger*; and a *relapse* is commonly worse than the *disease*.

There were no *weekly blosphemous papers* suffered to go abroad in the times of *forty-one*; even *that* age would not bear *this!* and so there was no need of such an extraordinary method as I have undertaken.

And I began it with that diffidence, and so unwillingly, that I thought not to continue it, only would try my hand a little; I could not forbear to throw one *bucket* into the *fire* which I saw devouring *church* and *state!* therefore my first *paper* had no *number*, but passed as the *Observator*, which made some diversion, that I thought people would bear a few more, and would let me talk a little *serious* with them in time! This drew me on further and further till it is come to what it is. And when I several times grew *weary*, and would have *rested* my self, those of better judgment, and who I knew wished well to *religion*, the *church*, and the *nation*, would allow me no *respite*, and said I could not serve these better. And they gave me the ingenious *Sir Roger L'Estrange* for an example, who in bad times (but not so bad as these) gave check to a touring *faction* in this method. I was sensible of the difference of the *undertaker*, and the inequality of the *task*, which in many *circumstances* was more *difficult* than what Sir *Roger* performed so commendably, for the benefit of that and after ages. But however, as I said, I would try, for want of a better.

And if the discretion of the *bookseller* had not often interposed to be a *corrector* too, these *papers* had been better.

A LET-

A

LETTER

FROM

A Gentleman in the CITY

TO HIS

Friend in the COUNTRY

Concerning the threatened prosecution of the *Rehearsal*, put into the *news-papers*.

SIR,

YOU and I that are by-standers can judge most impartially of the wrangles of the town, which entertain us sometimes when we want better discourse.

You desire to know from me the ground there is for what your *news-papers* tell you, that the author of the *Rehearsal* is to be prosecuted for his *papers*, and that there are *warrants* of *high-treason* out against him, *&c.* You say you see no grounds for that method of proceeding, and would know the truth of the *fact* from me.

Sir, I can tell you no more than the talk of the town; it is through all the coffee-houses, and makes a great noise; but I can learn no other foundation for it but the industry of his opponents, who take pains to spread the report.

They talk of reaching him upon the *union act*, because he denies the *validity* of the *ordination*, and consequently of the *baptism* of the *kirk* in *Scotland*. But I suppose the *union* was only betwixt the two *nations* and not the *churches*. These stand at the same distance as before; and the zealots in *Scotland* make no scruple to call the *church* of *England* a *limb* of *Anti-Christ* and of the *whore* of *Babylon*, and pray publickly in their *pulpits* for her conversion from her *idolatry* and *superstition*, meaning our *liturgy* and *episcopacy*.

And the *church* and *clergy* here have not been better treated by the *dissenters* in a great multitude of very bitter *pamphlets*, besides the weekly papers of *Observators* and *Reviews* which go through the *nation*.

And the *Rehearsal* tells us, that the end of his engaging was to stop the torrent what he could, and in some measure to take off that prejudice which perpetual *aspersing* must cause in the *people* against the church and clergy, when nothing at all was said in their defence.

And the *kirk* in *Scotland* may bear more patiently his disputing their *ordinations* and *baptisms*, or if he has said any thing sharp against their *preachers*, when they see how patiently the *church* of *England* (though established) has born so many insults upon her constitution and her *clergy*.

Dan. De Foe in his *Hymn to Peace* having painted several of the *clergy* as black as his ink could make them, concludes thus against them all in general, p. 40.

Nor let our charity be censur'd here,
Because we crowds of characters forbear.
The bead roll of whose crimes would shew
Too black for our posterity to know;
And are conceal'd in mere compassion,
Not to themselves alone, but all the nation;
That foreign countries may not see
Our ecclesiastick *nudity*;
And it become a new proverbial jest,
To be as wicked as an English *priest*.

And

And in his *Review*, Vol. II. p. 141. he says, *The generality of the clergy serve to enflame* ——— And p. 142. *I appeal to you, gentlemen, whether, generally speaking, all over this unhappy nation, the clergy are not three parts in five in a close conjunction with the enemies of the government?* And p. 418. *If words could be made treason, one third at least of the inferior clergy in England would be hanged.* And p. 420. *If raving in the pulpit, and raging out of it, be loyalty, most of the inferior clergy are the loyalest men in the nation.* And p. 448. He calls the *act of uniformity scandalous to the church, injurious to the publick peace, and a grievance to the whole nation.*

This is insulting our *laws*, and attacking the *church* as to her *establishment* and *legal* security. The *act of uniformity* primo, *Eliz.* (printed before our *Common-Prayer-Book*) guards it with several *penalties* upon those who shall vilify or deprave it by *word*, *writing*, &c. impowering and enjoining the *bishops* to see this executed. Yet this has not hinder'd the most violent *invectives* against it; particularly *De Laune*'s *Plea for the Non-Conformists*, which having made the *popish rites and ceremonies* to be *paganish*, next makes those of the *church* of *England* to be *popish*, and was *burnt* above 20 years ago, but lately *re-printed* at least *seven* times, as the *Review* tells us in his *Preface* to the last *edition* 1706. and justifies and commends it all, and p. 2. calls those *martyrs*, to the number of near 8000 (as he most falsely asserts) who he says (as falsely) were *murdered* for the breach of this *act* in the reign of king *Charles* II. and lays it all upon the *church*.

The act of *toleration* takes not away or suspends any part of this security to the *church* in the *act* of queen *Elizabeth*, or in the *corporation* and *test acts*; nor (as I suppose) does the *union* meddle with them. And it would seem to me to be a breach of the *union* to purpose the taking away the *legal* security of the *churches* on either side, as they stood at the *union*, as if we should attempt the repeal of any law made for the security of the *kirk* in *Scotland*.

Yet the *Observator* now openly attacks the *test act*, and proposes its being repealed, *Num.* 81, 82. *Vol.* VII. besides several other *pamphlets*. And as I am credibly informed Mr. *S*——is now come over hither with a collection of three thousand pounds from the *presbyterians* in *Ireland* to promote the same project.

But the *Rehearsal* does not meddle with the *legal* security of the *kirk* in *Scotland*, nor does he propose the *repeal* of any of the *laws* made in her favour; or gives so much as any hint against the *union*; but goes wholly and solely upon the *church* dispute of *episcopacy* and *presbytery*, which I do not understand affects the *union* any manner of way, because it is built upon the supposition of two different *churches*, and to remain *different*.

Suppose *popery* had received the *legal* establishment in any of these *kingdoms*, would that hinder the *divines* of the other *kingdoms* to write against the *errors* of *Rome*, and endeavour to reclaim them?

But if the *papists established*, and those remaining in the *church of England kingdom*, should first attack the *church*, and *vilify* her *clergy*, and attempt the *repeal* of her *legal* establishment, would not she think she had right to defend her self, to repel the *scandals* against her, and even retort them where it might be justly done? And if this was denied her, or ill taken, would she not think her self in the most extreme *danger*, and that her *ruin* were designed, when all her *enemies* were let loose upon her, to *insult* her at their pleasure, and openly in *print*, and no fault found with them, but the displeasure light upon those who durst open their mouth in her defence; and *moderation* enjoined to those only, but not a word to the *attacking* side?

Sir, my opinion of these *papers* upon the whole is this. The *Rehearsal* came in late. The *Observators* and *Reviews* had been in possession of the kingdom some years before he began, and what I have quoted is not the thousandth part of the dirt they have thrown upon the *church*; and if they should pass unpunished, and he be called in question, it would look very strange; for after

after all that is ſaid, his crime is in defending the *church*. And though his *paper-war* is all upon the *defenſive*, yet in *defence* ſome blows muſt be returned, and the *aggreſſors* muſt thank themſelves.

But, as I told you, I believe nothing of theſe reports, they are ſet on foot by a party that would have it ſo.

And by this they have ſhamefully given up their cauſe; for as *De Foe* ſays in his *Preface* to *De Laune's Plea for the Non-Conformiſts*, *When arguments drive the opponents into paſſions and exceſſes, like ſtrong purges, 'tis a proof of their operation, that they cauſe griping pains in the very bowels of the patient.* And again, *The knocking-down-arguments of a goal*, &c. *are but the ſure refuge of a cauſe by no other arguments to be defended.*

If I hear any more of this matter, you ſhall know, from

SIR,

January 18, 1708.

Your very humble Servant.

CAS-

CASSANDRA.

(But I hope not)

Telling what will come of it.

NUM. I.

IN

ANSWER

TO THE

Occasional Letter.

NUM I.

WHEREIN THE

New ASSOCIATIONS, &c.

Are CONSIDERED.

The THIRD EDITION.

Printed in the YEAR MDCCL.

CASSANDRA.

WHEN *God* has determin'd *destruction* to a *nation*, he takes away their *senses*, they have *eyes* and *see* not, *ears* and *hear* not, they will not *understand*.

There is a set of men amongst us, who are visibly driving on (whether themselves know it or not) the ruin of these *nations*; by setting up the *principles*, and carrying on the same *pretences*, which began and at last compleated the bloody *revolution* of *forty-one*, with the destruction of the *church*, the *king*, and the *laws*.

And when their *principles* are examin'd to the bottom; and their former *practices* laid before them, with all the dismal *consequences*; it has no other effect with them, than to excite their *rage* tenfold more. They give no other *answer* than the *craftsmen* at *Ephesus*, to cry out hours together, *Great is our Diana!*

And if this *noise* and *clamour* can carry it against *reason*, the *authority* of the *holy scriptures*, the known *laws* of the *land*, and our own sad *experience*, what can be the issue, but what it was before, if not worse, as of sins repeated, our utter *destruction!*

The *ten tribes* who revolted under *Sheba* return'd again: but never after their *second* defection under *Jeroboam*; till they were finally cut off, and their *name* lost upon the earth to this day. And it is observable, That in the succession of nineteen *kings* which they had in that time, there was not one *good*, though all of their own *choosing*.

I. Of placing the *radical* power of *government* in the people.

The root and foundation of all our *republican schemes*, and pretences for *rebellion*, is this suppos'd radical power in the *people*, as of erecting *government* at the beginning, so to *overturn* and *change* it at their pleasure.

To

To obviate this, the author of the *New Association*, Part 2d. *Supplement*, p. 4. *&c.* carries us to matter of *fact*, how *political* government did begin in the *world*; and how the *world* was, at first, *divided* into several *nations*; and shews, that this was not done by the *election* of the *people*; but by that most stupendous *miracle* of the *division* of *tongues*; whereby all of one *language* sorting together, and *God* placing a *governor* over them, they became a distinct *nation*. And he likewise tells us, that from that first *division* of the *world* into seventy distinct *nations* and *languages*, mention'd in the xth of *Genesis*, we have the *names* of the several *governors* where *histories* have been preserv'd, from *Nimrod* all the way to this present *Emperor* of *Germany*, for example, and so of others.

Then as to the reason of the thing, he brings arguments to shew, that *government* could not be founded, nor the world *divided* into *nations*, upon that foot of the *election* of the *people*. That this *hypothesis* would render all governments *precarious*, and eternally liable to *change* and *confusion*. That it was never yet known, nor ever can be, what is meant by the word *people* in this scheme of *government*. For the *whole people* never *chose*; and a *part* of the *people* is not the *whole*. That the *whole* or *half* of the *people* do not *choose* those who are called *representatives* of the *people* in *England*. And far less in *Holland*, *Venice*, or any *republick* that is in the world. That this *scheme* of deriving *government* from the *people*, is much more *destructive* of the *rights*, *liberties*, and *safety* of *mankind*, than the other *model* of *divine right* in the *governors*, as having their *power* from *God*.

Now let us see what is answer'd to this, in the *Occasional Letter*.

As to the first part, the *original* of *government*, and the *division* of *nations*, it is said, p. 20. That *people were at first divided out of necessity*. And supposing the *governor* not to do right to his people, *they would*

would have had a right to have proceeded to a new choice. This ſuppoſes the firſt *diviſion* to have been by the *election* of the *people.* And his bare ſaying ſo is all the proof he brings. He anſwers not a word to the plain *matter* of *fact*, which is directly againſt him. But adds, that he *laughs* at *divine right*, and *thinks it ſo trifling an argument, as not to deſerve a ſerious conſideration.* He ſays, *I cannot ſee any reaſon to think that one man was exalted ſo much above the reſt, for his own, but the people's ſake.* That is true. But then there are ſeveral reaſons given in the *New Aſſoc.* why it is beſt for the *people* not to have the *choice* in themſelves; and none of them are anſwer'd. However this is going from *matter* of *fact* to *reaſoning.* Will they then yield the *fact?* and let us *reaſon* afterwards? He ſays *(ibid.) That when* Jacob *died, we find no manner of ſuperiority left to his eldeſt ſon* Reuben. This is *objecting*, inſtead of *anſwering.* What has this to do with the firſt *diviſion* of *nations?* This is ſkipping from one thing to another, without anſwering *diſtinctly* to any thing. This goes upon the point of the *primogeniture*; which is a different head of argument, from the *diviſion* of *nations*; and comes in the ſecond place, the other being firſt ſettled. And ſettled it is, for any thing this *author* ſays to the contrary. Therefore I will anſwer him as to this, that he will find the right of the *primogeniture* fully aſſerted in that ſame caſe of *Reuben, Gen* xlix. 3. Where *Reuben*, on account of his *primogeniture* only, is call'd the *excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power.* But he was rejected (as *Cain* and *Eſau* were) for his wickedneſs, becauſe he *went up to his father's bed*, ver. 4.

He ſays *(ibid.) and when diviſion was made, it was by lot.* What *diviſion* does he mean? Was this the *diviſion* of *nations?* which is the point he was to anſwer. Or was it the *diviſion* of the *Holy Land* among the twelve *tribes*, by *Joſhua?* What has this to do with the *people's* choice of their *governors?* Was it the

the *lots* suppos'd to be cast among the *tribes*, *families*, and *persons*, upon the election of *Saul?* But he was *anointed* by *Samuel* before that, 1 *Sam.* x. 1. And it was *God* who ordered the *lots* (if any) to be cast. And the *people* knew not *Saul*, nor after the *lot* fell upon him, where to find him, *ver.* 22. And when *God* had told them where he was, *Samuel* said *to all the people, see ye him whom the Lord hath chosen*, ver. 24. So that here is no foundation for the *election* of the *people*, but the direct contrary. *Saul* first chosen by *God*; then *reveal'd* to *Samuel*, and by him *anointed*; then shew'd to the *people* by him. Whether any *lots* were cast in the case is not certain, for there is no mention of it in the *text*; only said that such a *tribe*, such a *family*, and such a *person* was *taken*. For ought we know, *Samuel* himself nam'd them all; but that is not material. For however it was, it was by *God*'s express ordering, without any *election* of the *people*, as to the *person*.

However this is foreign to the first *division* of *nations*, and the *original* of *political government*, upon which the *author* of the *New Assoc.* does insist. And gives this reason for it, p. 9. *that all factions have recourse to this, when they are about to unhinge and overturn settled constitutions.* For the *original power* of the *people* in *general*, is not to be taken from the special dispensation given to any one *nation* or *particular people*; but from the rights of *mankind*, considered in their *natural* state. And whether the first *division* of *nations*, and *original* of *political government* among *men*, arose from *mankind* in this *suppos'd* state of *nature*, and by their own *free* and *voluntary election*: Or, whether by the *institution* of *God*, without the *election* of the *people?* is the question we are concern'd to discuss. For if the *latter* be the case, then the *people* have no *original* rights to claim, as to the disposition of *governments*.

But says the *Occasionalist*, p. 17. suppose, "that "governments were from the beginning instituted by "God,

"God, and that he set a ruler over every nation.——
"The people had as much a divine right to their
"rulers protection, as they had a right to govern. And
"let us (says he) put matters upon this foot, I shall
"be ready enough to grant a divine right."

Well then, we will put matters upon this *foot!* Now see if we can agree.

I grant therefore, that *people* have a *right* to the *protection* of their *governors*, and a *property* in their *possessions*; and by the *divine law*. Insomuch that if their *rulers*, whom *God* has set over them, do *invade* their *rights*, they make themselves obnoxious to the *divine law*, and to the *judgment of God*, for so doing.

But now the question still remains, whether the *people*, in such a case, can right themselves, by taking *arms* against their *governors?* by deposing them, and *choosing* others in their room?

And for the *negative* these reasons are urged in the *New Association*.

1. That the *right* of the *governors* being *divine*, must, upon no account, be *invaded*. And that we make ourselves obnoxious to the *divine vengeance*, if we *invade* his *right!* as he does, if he *invades* ours.

2. That we cannot take *arms* and *depose* him, without assuming the *power* of *government* to ourselves; which upon the *scheme* now suppos'd, is *usurping* the *sword* of *God*, which he never gave us; and consequently a *rebellion* against *God*; putting ourselves in his place; and a dissolving of the *constitution* which he has *ordain'd* to *represent* himself; and by which he does *govern* the *world*.

3. That by *unhinging* of *government*, and putting it in the *people*, we shall bring greater *mischiefs* upon ourselves, than those we seek to avoid under our *governors* of *God*'s appointment. And our *confusions* can have no end in that frame of things: because the *centre* of *government* can never be *fix'd* in the *people*; that being a word of no certain denomination. And

contending

contending parties may fight it out upon equal claim of *right*, to the end of the world. Therefore that there can be no lasting *settlement*, no *security*, but in a *divine right*, to which all ought to submit.

4. Let me add, that our *lives* are only at *God's* disposal who gave them. He has not left them in our own power; therefore we cannot by any acts of ours, give that to others, which we have not ourselves; give to any other a power over our *lives*. And consequently the power of *life* and *death* can never be given by the *election* of the *people*; or any other ways than by a *divine right*; without which there can be no obligation of *conscience* to obey any *government*, or not to overturn it, if I can gain a stronger party to my side; for then it is the *people!* And if the lesser number prevail, they are the *people*; and the *balance* of *power* is on their side! The *minor* may be the *potior pars*. And setting aside *divine* authority, I know no man has power over me, more than I over him; since *nature* has put us all upon a *level*. And I will break loose from him, when I can, as from a *robber*; and so may he from me. And if the *major* number say, you may quit the country, if you like not the *frame* and *constitution* which we have *voted*; I will say, no. Who gave you *power* to *banish* me my *country?* It is my *country* as well as yours. And for the *major vote*, the *greatest part* of the world are *knaves* and *fools*. I am born *free*, and no man has right to take my *freedom* from me. And if I can gather a *party*, though *fewer*, we will fight you for it. I grant we do it at our *peril*. But what I say, is, that there is no obligation of *conscience* on either side. There is no such thing as *right* and *wrong*, as *just* or *unjust*. Nor can there be any *settlement* of *government*, till we come to a *divine* right. To what else should I give up my *life* or my *liberty*, if I can preserve them? Though I should do it by overturning twenty *governments* that stand upon no other *foundation* than what I carry within my own breast,

breast, that is, the *original right* and *freedom* of *mankind*. By which *two* men have no other *power* over *one*, but *force*; and that may be repelled by *force*. Here is no *authority* to which I ought to *obey*, for *conscience* sake.

As to the case of *usurpers*, and *commonwealths*, it is answer'd in the *New Association*, *Suppl.* p. 9. That the *government* in being has the right, where there is none who claim a *better* right. But this not from the *election* of the *people*, if that were suppos'd, for no *government* or *constitution* was ever yet set up by the free and equal *election* of all the *people*: But as *possessing* that *authority*, which *God* at first founded in the *division* of *nations*, and design'd to continue to the end of the world; if those in *possession* came wrongfully by it, they will answer it to *God*. But still it is theirs of *right*, where none *claim* a better *right* to it than they have. As a man who *steals* a *hat*, has a *right* to it against any but the *owner*; so that if any others take it from him by *force*, it is *robbery* in them: And yet the act of *robbery* always remains a *sin*. And notwithstanding, *possession* gives a *right*, against all who have not a *better* right. And this arises from the necessity of *government*, which *God* himself at first did *institute*, and ordained to *continue*. And which never yet did, or ever can devolve to the *people*. For that would be perfect *anarchy*; which, as my lord *bishop* of *Sarum* well says, *opens a door to endless confusions, which will never admit of order or remedy*. And he makes it worse than putting the *power* into the hands of the most cruel *tyrant*, even of the *pope* himself.

Vindication of the *church* and *state* of *Scotland*. p. 68, 69.

Now let us see what the *Occasional Letter* says to these things.

It says thus, p. 20. " And how unfit this writer " may imagine a heady multitude to be, to fix upon " order or government, yet it is certain, that necessi- " ty will bring them to it; and it will be strange, if " there should not be among them some, that have

" heads wise enough to invent a scheme, for their " security and protection, which the largest part will " agree to: And the rest, if they please, may separate " and remove, where they think to be better go- " vern'd."

Now instead of this being an *answer* to what is advanc'd in the *New Assoc.* (part of which is set down before) *that* is a direct *answer* to *this*; and it is shew'd there, that there can be no such *scheme* invented, by any *heads* how *wise* soever. Why will they not shew such a *scheme* to us? They have been long about it! And many *schemes* have they made; yet none will hold! They can never make one, upon the foot of the *people*, that is not altogether *precarious*, *nonsense*, and *contradiction*. That can give any *basis* or *settlement* to *government*: or oblige any to submit for *conscience* sake: Nay further, That do's not destroy and utterly subvert their *beloved* and *foundation-principle* of the *original freedom* and *independance* of the *people*; since all these *schemes* end in a *force* upon those, who will not comply with their *constitution*.

And all the *answer* hitherto given by these *scheme-mongers*, is only to say, They are sure there may be such a *scheme!* And it were strange (as this author says) *if there shou'd not!*

II. Concerning the *laws* of the *land*, and our own *constitution*.

Finding no relief in *arguments* or *schemes*, he produces an *instance*, which he thinks none *dare* answer. He represents our *constitution* and the *laws*, as founded upon the *people*. Then proves that this cannot be *jure divino*: And so his point is gain'd—— !

I shall the more willingly answer this, because many are deceiv'd by it; and understand not our *constitution* or the *laws*, or wilfully *mistake* them.

He begins p. 16, with making the *queen*, (or *king*) *lords* and *commons* the *three estates*. And makes the *balance* of *power* to consist in their *good agreement*. But says he, " If either grows arbitrary, and breaks " through

" through their bounds at pleasure, then publick liber-
" ty is indeed in danger, and we know not where to
" look for it. But when the regular order is observ'd,
" then 'tis very easy to know where to find it. Here
" the center of government is plac'd, and I hope will
" long continue; notwithstanding all the trifling,
" groundless pretences of a jus divinum to prove it
" unlawful."

Here is a *centre* indeed, and a *balance!* One would think he were playing *booty!* He makes three co-ordinate *powers*, each at liberty to *encroach* upon the other, and gain more of the *balance* to themselves; and if these, or any *one* of them should differ with the *other*, then he confesses there is no *centre* or *balance* at all! There is no *judge* betwixt them, the *sword* must decide it.

Is it then a thing so rare to be found, was it never heard of, that *king*, *lords*, and *commons* should differ about their several *powers*, *privileges*, and *prerogative?*

Especially considering that in the second part of *New Assoc. Suppl.* p. 11. which this Author is here answering, that same *treatise* which in this very *page*, p. 16. he calls a *learned* and *judicious* one, is quoted, saying, " That in the whole compass of history, no one single
" example can be brought, of any one popular assem-
" bly, who after beginning to contend for power, ever
" sat down quietly with a certain share. *And* that no
" one instance could be produc'd of a popular assembly
" that ever knew, or propos'd, or declar'd what share
" of power was their due." And concludes, " That
" there is no *hopes* of this *matter* being *adjusted*."

Now let this *author* answer his own *learned and judicious treatise*; or otherwise confess, that his *centre* and *balance* of *power* is impracticable, of which no *instance* can be given in *history*; and no *method* possible to be prescrib'd for it, since none of the *balancers* do *know*, and therefore cannot *agree* what *share* of *power* is *their due*.

III *Of the* King, *and the* three estates.

To make out this *ridiculous scheme* of *government*, our modern *balancers* of *power* have reviv'd again (and for the same ends) the *traiterous* and long since exploded *notion* of their *predecessors* in the *rebellion* of *forty-one*, That the *king* is a *part* of the *parliament*, and *one* of the three estates of *parliament*; and so *co-ordinate* with the *two houses* of *lords* and *commons*; that having thus brought him to a *level* with his *subjects*, they might the more easily *depose* him.

This they proclaim'd aloud in their *Observators*, and often repeated. Which being fully and judiciously answer'd in the *Heraclitus*, *Numb.* 10, 12, 13. That the *king* is none of the three *estates*, and several *acts of parliament* quoted, which makes it clear past *contradiction*, or other answer from the *Observator*, than his *buffoonry*, after this manner, *Let me have my queen*, (as he *insolently*, and in *ridicule* treats her *majesty*) *and lords and commons, and let him have as many estates as he will.*

But I was surpriz'd to find this *author* of the *Occasional Letter* (whom I suppose of an higher figure) to *chime* in with such *senseless scribblers*, and to trump up this *jargon* again upon us! There must be some *design* on foot! If he had kept the *church*, he might have found a solution of this point, in the *office* for *gunpowder treason* (which is likewise an *act* of *parliament*) where we bless *God* for preserving the *king*, and the *three estates of this realm assembled in parliament.*

Who these *estates* are, is plainly set down 24 *H.* VIII. c. 12. The first are the *prelates* or *lords spiritual*, representing the *body spiritual*. The *second* are the *temporal nobility*, who sit in the same *house* with the *spiritual nobility*, as they are call'd 26 *H.* VIII. c 2. *The nobles spiritual and temporal.* And the *third estate* are the *commons*. Thus say they to the *king*, 25 *H.* VIII. c. 21. *Your lords spiritual, and temporal, and commons, representing the whole state of your realm.* But for the *king*, in the foresaid *statute*, 24 *H.* VIII. c. 12. He is call'd the "One supreme head and king—— Unto "whom

" whom a body politick, compact of all sorts and de-
" grees of people, divided in terms, and by names of
" spiritualty and temporalty, been bounden and owen
" to bear, next to *God*, a natural and humble obedi-
" ence. He being also instituted and furnished by the
" goodness and sufferance of Almighty God, with ple-
" nary, whole, and entire power, pre-eminence, au-
" thority, prerogative, and jurisdiction, to render and
" yield justice, and final determination to all manner of
" folk, resiants or subjects within this his realm, in all
" causes, matters, debates, and contentions, *&c.*"

Here is a *dernier resort*, and *centre* of *government*.

And here the *body* of the *people* is divided into two *branches* of *spiritualty* and *temporalty*. Of the *temporalty* there are two *estates*, the *lords temporal*, and the *commons*. But the *body spiritual* is a distinct *estate* by it self, and the *first* of the *three*. And it is more *distinct* from the other *two*, than they are from each other, as differing from them, in a *specifical* manner; for they *both* are comprehended under one denomination of *temporalty*, and are the several *parts* of it; whereas the *spiritualty* is of a different *nature*, and *incommunicable* with the other.

And this was made very apparent, in that the *body spiritual* were not *taxable* by *king* and *parliament*, but only by *themselves*. The *possessions* of the *church* being reckon'd the *patrimony* of *God*, being *dedicated* to *him* and to his *church*; and therefore no *temporal* power could lay their hands upon it, under *peril* of *sacrilege*.

And the *clergy* were never *taxed* but by *convocation*, till the cursed *revolution* of *forty-one*, which overturn'd all *foundations*. And after the *restoration*, when, before things cou'd be settl'd upon the old *foot*, the *taxings* us'd by the *usurpers*, was (for the present only intended to be) continu'd. In the first *act of parliament*, which *taxed* the *clergy* in common with the *laity*, there is an express *proviso*, saving to the *clergy*, their antient and undoubted *right* of *taxing* themselves. But a *precedent* once made, it has been carry'd on to this day.

And as the *possessions*, so much more the *persons* of the *clergy* were esteem'd so *sacred*, as that, if any of them were guilty of a *capital* crime, or which deserv'd a *personal shame* or *punishment*, care was taken to preserve the *character* from sharing in the *disgrace*, by the *person*'s being first *degraded* by his *spiritual* superiors, and so deliver'd up, as a *lay-man*, to the *Brachium Seculare*.

If the *church* wou'd not deliver him up, there' is no reason that he shou'd escape the *judgment* of the *law*, as it was in the times of *popery*. But it is highly reasonable that he shou'd be try'd. If the *church* refuses, it is her fault. And it is very improbable she wou'd refuse what conduc'd so much to the preserving of her *authority* and *reputation*.

Wou'd it be *decent* to see a *clergyman* hang'd in his *gown?*

And were it not fit some other hand shou'd *disrobe* him, than the *executioner?*

The *canonical habit* is not so *sacred* as the *character*.

We have seen *clergymen* both *whipp'd* and *pillory'd*, and *hang'd* too, within these few years, without being *degraded*, or the question so much as ask'd at their *bishops*, or perhaps their knowing it, but as others, from the publick *news*.

Tho' the *exemption* of *clergymen* from the *secular* power, even in *secular* causes, was an *unreasonable* and *unjust usurpation* of *popery*; yet *Christianity*, and regard to *religion* in general, do's require, that the *ministers* thereof shou'd be so far exempted from publick *contempt*, as that when they suffer for *personal* crimes, their *punishment* shou'd be only *personal*, and their *profession* not *suffer* with them.

However, while the *laws* so stood, no *clergyman*, till reduc'd to a *layman*, cou'd be *try'd* by *laymen*. Which abundantly shews the *spiritualty* to be a distinct *estate*.

And

And by the way, this seems a full confutation of that (with submission) *vulgar error*, even amongst our *lawyers*, that a *bishop* has all the *privileges* of other *peers*, except that of being *try'd* by his *peers*; for which the reason given is, That there is no *precedent* for it in our *law*. How cou'd there, when a *bishop* cou'd not be *try'd* at all, but by his *fellow-bishops?* These only were reckon'd his *peers*, as being *members* of the *first estate*: And no *member* of one *estate*, is to be *try'd* by any other *estate*; but when a *bishop* was *degraded*, he was put out of that *estate*, and reduc'd to a plain *commoner*, and *try'd* as such. The same as if a *temporal peer* were *degraded*. There are *temporal peers* whose *honours* are annex'd to such a *castle* or *manor*, which if they sell, they lose their *honour* and *peerage*; and after are to be *try'd* by their then *peers*, the *commons*. I take the cases to be parallel. And tho' the *bishops* are mostly reduc'd to the *temporal peerage*, except the *privilege* of *absenting*, if they please, in *tryals* of *blood*; yet surely they are not brought below that *peerage*, while they retain some *privileges* still above it. And while a *bishop* is a *peer*, he must have all the *privileges* of the *peerage*; unless what is taken away by *act* of *parliament*. For what else can take it away? See the learned bishop *Stillingfleet* his *Grand Question*.

Of bishops *being tryed by their* peers.

But to return. Tho' the *body spiritual* ever was, and is still so distinguishingly the *first* of the three *estates*, yet it is but *part* of the *body* of the *realm*. The *king*, and he *only*, is the *head* of the *realm*.

And the *crown* belongs to him *alone*, without any *partners*. And is in no *earthly subjection*, as it is declar'd, 16 *Rich.* II. c. 5. *That the crown of* England *hath been so free at all times, that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God, in all things touching the regality of the same crown, and to none other*. Then surley not to his subjects; as the three *estates* are.

And as the *possessions*, so much more the *persons* of the *clergy* were esteem'd so *sacred*, as that, if any of them were guilty of a *capital* crime, or which deserv'd a *personal shame* or *punishment*, care was taken to preserve the *character* from sharing in the *disgrace*, by the *person*'s being first *degraded* by his *spiritual* superiors, and so deliver'd up, as a *lay-man*, to the *Brachium Seculare*.

If the *church* wou'd not deliver him up, there' is no reason that he shou'd escape the *judgment* of the *law*, as it was in the times of *popery*. But it is highly reasonable that he shou'd be try'd. If the *church* refuses, it is her fault. And it is very improbable she wou'd refuse what conduc'd so much to the preserving of her *authority* and *reputation*.

Wou'd it be *decent* to see a *clergyman* hang'd in his *gown?*

And were it not fit some other hand shou'd *disrobe* him, than the *executioner?*

The *canonical habit* is not so *sacred* as the *character*.

We have seen *clergymen* both *whipp'd* and *pillory'd*, and *hang'd* too, within these few years, without being *degraded*, or the question so much as ask'd at their *bishops*, or perhaps their knowing it, but as others, from the publick *news*.

Tho' the *exemption* of *clergymen* from the *secular* power, even in *secular* causes, was an *unreasonable* and *unjust usurpation* of *popery*; yet *Christianity*, and regard to *religion* in general, do's require, that the *ministers* thereof shou'd be so far exempted from publick *contempt*, as that when they suffer for *personal* crimes, their *punishment* shou'd be only *personal*, and their *profession* not *suffer* with them.

However, while the *laws* so stood, no *clergyman*, till reduc'd to a *layman*, cou'd be *try'd* by *laymen*. Which abundantly shews the *spiritualty* to be a distinct *estate*.

And

And by the way, this seems a full confutation of that (with submission) *vulgar error*, even amongst our *lawyers*, that a *bishop* has all the *privileges* of other *peers*, except that of being *try'd* by his *peers*; for which the reason given is, That there is no *precedent* for it in our *law*. How cou'd there, when a *bishop* cou'd not be *try'd* at all, but by his *fellow-bishops?* These only were reckon'd his *peers*, as being *members* of the *first estate:* And no *member* of one *estate*, is to be *try'd* by any other *estate*; but when a *bishop* was *degraded*, he was put out of that *estate*, and reduc'd to a plain *commoner*, and *try'd* as such. The same as if a *temporal peer* were *degraded*. There are *temporal peers* whose *honours* are annex'd to such a *castle* or *manor*, which if they sell, they lose their *honour* and *peerage*; and after are to be *try'd* by their then *peers*, the *commons*. I take the cases to be parallel. And tho' the *bishops* are mostly reduc'd to the *temporal peerage*, except the *privilege* of *absenting*, if they please, in *tryals* of *blood*; yet surely they are not brought below that *peerage*, while they retain some *privileges* still above it. And while a *bishop* is a *peer*, he must have all the *privileges* of the *peerage*; unless what is taken away by *act* of *parliament*. For what else can take it away? See the learned bishop *Stillingfleet* his *Grand Question*.

Of bishops *being tryed by their* peers.

But to return. Tho' the *body spiritual* ever was, and is still so distinguishingly the *first* of the three *estates*, yet it is but *part* of the *body* of the *realm*. The *king*, and he *only*, is the *head* of the *realm*.

And the *crown* belongs to him *alone*, without any *partners*. And is in no *earthly subjection*, as it is declar'd, 16 *Rich.* II. c. 5. *That the crown of* England *hath been so free at all times, that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God, in all things touching the regality of the same crown, and to none other*. Then surley not to his subjects; as the three *estates* are.

And thus they ſtile themſelves, 1 *Eliz.* c. 3. Where *both houſes* of *parliament*, the *lords ſpiritual*, and *temporal*, and *commons* ſay to her *majeſty*, *We your faithful and obedient ſubjects, repreſenting the three eſtates of your realm of* England, *&c.*

Many other *ſtatutes* may be quoted to this purpoſe. But it is ſtrange that *clamour* has not been ſilenc'd, by the *act* (yet *un-repeal'd*) of 12 *Car.* II. c. 30. which was made on purpoſe againſt the *traiterous* principles and pretences of *forty-one*, particularly this of making the *king* co-ordinate with the two *houſes* of *parliament*, and *one* of the *three eſtates*; and explaining the former *laws* in this point. And there it is declar'd, "That "by the undoubted and fundamental laws of this king-"dom, neither the peers of this realm, nor the com-"mons, nor both together, in parliament, or out of "parliament, nor the people collectively or repreſen-"tatively, nor any other perſons whatſoever, ever "had, have, hath, or ought to have, any coercive "power over the perſons of the kings of this realm."

And 13 *Car.* II. c. 1. it is made *premunire*, either by "writing, printing, preaching, or other ſpeaking, "*to* declare or affirm, That both houſes of parliament, "or either houſe of parliament, have, or hath a le-"giſlative power, without the king, or any other "words to the ſame effect."

Again, in the ſame *ſtatute*, cap. 6. That the power of the *ſword* is ſolely in the king; "And that both or "either of the houſes of parliament cannot, nor ought "to pretend to the ſame; nor can, nor lawfully may "raiſe or levy any war, offenſive or defenſive, againſt "his majeſty, his heirs, or lawful ſucceſſors; and yet "the contrary thereof hath of late years been practi-"ſed, almoſt to the ruin and deſtruction of this king-"dom; and during the late uſurp'd governments, ma-"ny evil and rebellious principles have been diſtilled "into the minds of the people of this kingdom, which, "unleſs prevented, may break forth to the diſturbance "of the peace and quiet thereof."

And

And chap. 1. *it is said,* "That the growth and encrease of the late troubles and disorders, did in a very great measure proceed from a multitude of seditious sermons, pamphlets and speeches, daily preached and published, with a transcendent boldness defaming the person and government of your majesty, and your royal father, wherein men were too much encouraged: And above all, from the willful mistake of the supreme and lawful authority, whilst men were forward to cry up and maintain those orders and ordinances, oaths, and covenants, to be acts legal and warrantable, which in themselves had not the least colour of law or justice to support them; from which kind of distempers, as the present age is not yet wholly freed, so posterity may be apt to relapse into them, if a timely remedy be not provided," *&c.*

I think enough has been said to clear the sense of the *law* in this point, of the *king* being *one* of the *three estates*, and *co-ordinate* with the other *two*. Which wou'd make such a *centre* and *balance* of *power*, as *three kings* of *Bramford!* For indeed, it is setting up three *kings*. What else are three *powers*, each *independent* and *un-accountable* to *either* or *both* of the *other?* And, as our author before quoted says, when none of them *know*, nor will *determine* what *share* of the *balance* of *power* is *their due*.

This is the curious *watch* we are told of in Dr. *K——t*'s late thanksgiving *sermon* upon the 31st of *January*, 170¾. which, the oftner it is out of order, shews the greater *delicacy* in the *structure!*

There is such a curious *watch* now set up to *auction* in *Poland*. And our *whigs* bid fair for it, to have it brought over hither, as a *regulator* to our *time* of the *day!*

What a *curious* thing would it be, if thirty two *palatines*, and every *man* in *Poland* (of whom each has a *negative*) should all *agree* to a *tittle!*

But

But if *one* ſtarts out of the way, there is a *pin* loſt in the *watch*, and all is out of order! Which ſhews the *ſtricture* to be moſt *delicate!*

Such is that of the *power* of the *people* with us, which every man may ſet up, for or againſt *king*, *lords*, or *commons*, as he thinks fit. And *legion* againſt them all! Of which there is a new *edition* juſt now come out, with *additions* of *millions*.

The *author* of the *Occaſional Letter* having dreſſed up the *conſtitution* of *England* in ſuch a *frame* as this, had reaſon to ſay, as he does in the ſame *page* before quoted, p. 16. *Now this government of ours ſo modelled, can never be ſaid to be derived to us by any divine right.* No indeed! nor by any *right*, or even *common ſenſe!* But this is come upon him and his new *accomplices*, as the words of the *act* of *parliament* before quoted ſays, *from a wilful miſtake of the ſupreme and lawful authority.*

But he goes on, and ſays, p. 17. "I fancy thoſe "that contend moſt for the divine right of kings, will "allow that their monarchs cannot lawfully be limited "by the people, as I am ſure ours are."

Now ſuppoſe another ſhould be as *poſitive* as you are? and as *ſure*, that you cannot be *ſure!* For however *your monarchs*, as you call them, or would have them, are *limited*, I am ſure it is not by the *people*; but by a *party*, that call themſelves the *people*, as every other *party* of the *people* may, and always do, when they riſe up to overturn *governments*.

You may ſay, the *people* are *repreſented* as well as you can contrive. That may be. But you can never contrive it. How are they *repreſented*, when much the *major* number have no vote in the *election?* How can it be, when, according to the *ſcheme* of *power* in the *people*, the conſent of every *individual* is neceſſary? As Mr. *Locke* makes it out in his ſo much fam'd *Two Treatiſes of Government*, Book II. chap. 8. p. 316. printed, 1690. But in this *ſenſe*, the *people* are ſuch an *unwieldy body*, that they can do nothing,

can

can do no *act*, either *good* or *bad!* not so much a to ask, *What's a clock?*

But in the position of which you are so *sure*, there is the word *lawfully*,——*cannot lawfully* be *limited?* ——Now if by *lawfully* you mean, according to the *law* of the *land*, you are determin'd by the *act* of *parliament* just now quoted, which makes it *unlawful* for either or both *houses* of *parliament*, or for the *people*, either *collectively* or *representatively* to have any *coercive power* over the *king*.

But if by *lawful* you mean, not the *law* of the *land*, but the *law* of *nature*, by which *government* was first erected among *mankind*; then you must come to the *original*, and the first *division* of *nations*. And see if you can give a plainer account of it, and better *vouch'd*, than the *New Association* has shew'd from *Genesis*; to which you have given no answer. And let me add, that this *division* of *nations* was not brought to pass *gradually*, in a long *tract* of *time*, and in several *ages*, as *people* multiplied and spread over the earth: But it was one *act*, done at one *time*, by that most astonishing *miracle* of the *division* of *tongues*, which did distinguish the *nations*. And that this was a most remarkable *time*, and greatly *notic'd*, appears from *Gen.* x. 25. when the name of *Peleg* (which signifies *division*) was given to the son of *Eber*, for as the *text* says, *In his days was the earth divided*. This was one of the most memorable *Æras* of the world, and ought not to be forgotten by us. How can it be forgotten, while the *mark* of it still appears with us, that is the multiplicity of *languages?* But it is forgotten! And the best reason, I can assign for it, is, that our *republican virtuosos*, who are generally *deists*, are better vers'd in *heathen authors*, than the *holy scriptures*; which they seldom read, but to *ridicule*, or pick *holes* in them. They are not in the class of their *Belle-Lettre*. And *Horace* or *Tacitus* is a better *text* with them, than *Genesis*. But as there is no *heathen author* extant so ancient as *Moses*, so likewise (as we are told in the

second *Part* of *New Association*, *Suppl.* p. 8.) there is no *heathen history* whatsoever, wherein there is the least *footstep* or *umbrage* of this *independent* condition of *mankind*, when they were all in this suppos'd state of *nature*, without any *government* among them. Therefore these *scheme-makers* go to their own *brains*, and invent, contrive, and fancy such *times* and *circumstances* of *mankind*, as never were in the world! And from thence (to shew their *ingenuity*) frame such *models* and *original* of *government*, as are all *impossibilities!* And at the same time, call this account from *Genesis*, a *precarious supposition*. As this *Occasional Letter* does, *p.* 17. If the history of *Genesis* be *precarious* with them, they are desir'd to shew a *better* on their side.

And this is not meer matter of *speculation*; it is of the highest *importance* to have it *settl'd* and *determin'd*. Because it is the only *asylum* to which our *mutinous* and *seditious spirits* do fly, when they are about making *insurrections*, and disturbing of *government*.

For no *constitution* can be *broken* by its own *laws*, which were made to *preserve* it. You see in what is before quoted, how *positive* and *express* our own *laws* are in barring out all the *pretences* of *rebellion*. Therefore the *seditious* will not be determin'd by our *laws* or *constitution*; but fly *higher*, to the *original* of *government* in the world. And there they think they have *scope* enough to *amuse*, and *suppose* just to their own humour! Therefore, as they have stated the *case*, this is the very *jugulum causæ*. It is the first *step* we must take, and then the rest will go on more *smoothly*.

Let them then give an *account*, and name the *time*, when *political government* began in the *world*; and *how*, and by what *methods* the *world* was *divided* into several *nations*. Whether this was done by an equal *poll* or *vote* of the whole world gather'd together; or their *votes* sent from *far*, to set the *bounds* and *meres* of every *country*, and determine who and who should live in each, in the *worst* countries, as well as the

the *best*; and who ſhould be the *ruler* in each *country?* Let them ſhew this, or make it *poſſible* upon the *foot* of the *people!*

Now in the *New Aſſociation* in the place laſt quoted, there is an attempt made to ſhew every one of theſe particulars. Firſt, that it was *the Moſt High, who divided the nations.* Deut. xxxii. 8. Secondly, that it was done by the *diviſion* of *languages.* That they were divided, *after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations,* Gen. x. 20. Thirdly, *that in the diviſion of the nations of the whole earth, he* (God) *ſet a ruler over every people,* Ecclus. xvii. 17. Fourthly, that this was done in the days of *Eber,* which made him call his ſon *Pelag, for in his days was the earth divided,* Gen. x. 25.

We are told likewiſe in the ſame place of the *New Aſſociation,* that this was about an hundred years after the *flood*; when *mankind* were ſo *encreaſed,* as to be thus *divided.* Before which time, we may well ſuppoſe that *Noah* had the ſupreme *government*; though ſeveral *families* might be *manumitted,* and have a diſtinct *government* of their own, under the ſeveral *heads* of *families,* yet with a due *ſubordination* to their common *parent.* But before this time of the *diviſion* of the *earth,* we read no where of *nations.* And therefore we may take the riſe of *political* government from this *original*; and we muſt ſtick to it, till our *popular orators* can ſhew a better.

IV. *Concerning the* limitations *of* government.

But the great prejudice remains ſtill, that if the *original* of *political government* be thus immediately from *divine inſtitution*; and that every *ruler* now, (where there is no *competition* by any other, who claims a better *right* than he in *poſſeſſion*) does ſucceed to the ſame *divine right* which God gave to the firſt *rulers* whom he plac'd over every *people,* at the firſt *diviſion* of *nations*: Then it will follow, that no *ruler* can be *limited* by the *people,* or *any* of them; and conſequent-

ly, that all *governments* must be *absolute* and *arbitrary*; which makes a dreadful *sound* to *English* ears!

This is the meaning of what is before quoted out of this *Occasional Letter*, p. 17. "I fancy those that con-"tend most for the divine right of kings, will allow "that their monarchs cannot lawfully be limited by "the people."

As to the *lawfulness*, and by what *law*, I have spoke already. But that this may not seem a *put off*, I will answer more directly.

I. *Limitations of concession.*

There are *limitations* of *concession*, and *limitations* of *coercion*. The first sort, as well as the last, are always given by *superiors* to their *inferiors*. Thus the great *God* is pleas'd to *limit* himself, when he makes *covenants*, and grants *conditions* to *mankind*; and is *oblig'd* by his *veracity*, to *perform them*.

Thus *fathers* may *limit* themselves to their *children*.

And thus, *kings* may *limit* themselves to their *subjects*, by granting them such and such *laws*, and giving them the assurance of their solemn *oaths* to observe them.

Original Contract.

And this is all the *original contract* can be shew'd betwixt *kings* and *people*. But it is neither *original* nor *contract*.

First, not *original*; because *laws* are made by *kings*; therefore *kings* must be before *laws*. Let the *law* be produced that made the first *king*; even here in *England*. We have been under *kings*, as far as *history* can carry us. And all the *laws* that we have, have been made by *kings*.

Our *parliaments* do *recognize* our *kings*; see the *acts* of *recognition*, 1 *Eliz. c.* 3. and 1 *Jac. c.* 1. Where the *parliament* acknowledges their prior *right* from the *proximity* of *blood*; which is called the *law* of *God*, as well as of *man*. These *parliaments* did not pretend to *make* them *kings*, or to *bestow* the *crown*, as at their disposal. But did, in most *humble* manner, *recognize* and *acknowledge* their *right* as from *God* "And "thereunto

" thereunto (ſays the *parliament*) we moſt humbly " and faithfully do ſubmit and oblige ourſelves, our " heirs and poſterity for ever, until the laſt drop of " our bloods be ſpent."

Secondly, laws which *kings* make, are no *contract*; they are wholly *conceſſions* on one ſide, on the ſide of the *king*. Our *Magna Charta* which begins our *Statute book*, is *wholly* and *ſolely* from the *king*, and expreſſed to be granted of his *meer and free will*.

Afterwards the *lords* or the *commons* did humbly *petition* to the *king*, that ſuch *laws* ſhould be made; as the *ſtile* of our former *acts* of *parliament* does ſhew.

Be it *enacted* by the *king*, or *our ſovereign lord* the *king* hath *ordained* by the *advice* of the *lords*, and the *humble petition* of the *commons*, &c.

The *lords* might *adviſe*, and the *commons* may *petition*, but the *enacting* part is only in the *king*. He *enacts* with *their advice*, not *they* with *his*. He only is *ſovereign*, in all *cauſes*, and over all *perſons*.

Kings *negative* voice.

Not by way of having a *negative* voice, as one of the *three* co-ordinate *powers* (according to the *ſtile* of *forty-one*, and of our preſent *whigs*) for *three*, or *threeſcore negatives* cannot make an *affirmative*. A *negative* is only ſaying, this ſhall *not* be a *law*. But who has power to ſay, this *ſhall* be a *law?* And whoſe ſaying ſo, does make it a *law?* That is only the *king*, whoſe *fiat* ſtamps the *authority* of a *law* upon what the *three eſtates* have prepared. And if he *likes* it not, he may *reject* it. The *three eſtates* may bring *bullion:* But it is the impreſſion of the *king*'s *image* and *ſuperſcription*, and that *only*, which makes it *coin*. And it is *treaſon* to *counterfeit* it.

Now though the *king* has *limited* himſelf, by way of *conceſſion*, not to make *laws* without the *three eſtates:* Yet he has not parted with any of his *prerogative* to them, nor *parcelled* out the *ſupreme power* among theſe *eſtates* as ſome fooliſhly think.

For

For all *power* is *one* and *indivisible*, whether in the hands of *one* or *many*. There must be a *dernier resort*, or there can be no *government*. And where this is in an *assembly*, that *assembly* is one *body*, as one *person*. And the particular *persons* who compose that *assembly*, have not the *power* shar'd among them, none of them have any *part* of the *power* at all. For the *act* of the *body* only is the *law*.

Now in such a *constitution* it is necessary, that every *member* of this *assembly* should have *free* and *equal vote*, that one should not have a *commanding power* over another. Nor the power of *one* be *deriv'd* from *another*. But every *member* sits there, by the same *authority*.

But how different is this from our *constitution*? Where the *king* is *supreme* and *sovereign*, and his crown *imperial*! Where both *houses* of *lords* and *commons* stile themselves his *majesty*'s most *dutiful* and *loyal subjects*! And take *oaths* of *allegiance* to him, asserting him to be the *only supreme governor*, in *all causes*, and over *all persons*.

Whose *authority* gives *being* to, and *creates* the *parliament*; and *dissolves* them at his *pleasure*, with the *breath* of his *mouth*!

Insomuch that the same *persons* meeting without his *authority*, are an *unlawful assembly*, and punishable by the law!

How then can *this* authority be deriv'd from *them*! can the *creatures* make its *creator*!

Are they then *co-ordinate powers* with *him*, who derive what *authority* they have from *him*!

And as the *king* may bring what *persons* he pleases into the *house* of *lords*, without asking their *consent*; he has not so far yet *limited* himself: So the *limitation* of what *persons* shall *vote* for *members* of the *house* of *commons*, is *wholly* and *solely* from the *king*, as all our *laws* are. This was never determin'd by a *free* and *equal vote* of all the *people*. Let our *commonwealths-men* shew that! As for what *advice* the *king* took in doing

of this, that is not the matter. The *parliament* is call'd the *king*'s great *council.*

And we have several *acts* of *parliament* wherein the *king* did not take the *advice* of all the *three estates.* As 3 *Rich.* II. c. 2. *Our lord the king, by the advice and assent of all the lords temporal — hath ordain'd and establish'd,* &c. This was a case wherein the *bishops* were concern'd; and therefore their *advice* was not ask'd. And 13 *Rich.* II. c. 1. In a case where the *commons* were *complainants*, the *king* enacts, *By the assent of the great men and nobles.* Several other instances of this sort may be given. And tho' the method be alter'd now, and all our *acts* carry by advice and consent of the *three estates* distinctly nam'd, *viz. lords spiritual, temporal*, and *commons*; yet all this is from the *king*. He could not have been *compell'd* to it. It is a *limitation* of *concession* which he has granted.

Our *constitution* was not always as it is now. They who were vers'd in the *rolls* of *parliament*, will find there *precedents* of *parliaments*, summoned without either *citizens* or *burgesses*, only *knights*, sometimes *two*, sometimes but *one*. Of *parliaments* summon'd for one *knight*, two *citizens* and two *burgesses*. *Parliaments* summon'd to meet in less than forty days; and after summons, *dissolv'd* before *meeting*. Summon'd to one *place*, and before *meeting* order'd to another *place*, and to a further *day*. They will find *writs* requiring the same *members* as in the preceding *parliament*. *Writs* directed to *corporations* for two *burgesses*, and to the *sheriffs* but for one *knight:* They will find the *speaker* of the *house* of *commons* (in vacation) taken in *execution*, and *imprison'd*, and a new *speaker* chosen. So that their *privileges* were not always as they are now. Nay no longer ago than the *reign* of queen *Elizabeth*, we find her *limiting* the *freedom* of *speech* in the *house* of *commons* to the bare giving of their vote, *yea* or *no*. But not to meddle with reforming or transforming either *church* or *commonwealth*. And the *speaker* order'd to *reject* such

Townshen's *collections* printed 1680. *p.* 37, 38.

such *bills, if offer'd, until they be view'd and consider'd of by those whom it is fitter shou'd consider of such things, and can better judge of them.* And the *privilege* of their *persons* so *limited*, as *that no man's ill doings, or not performing of duties, be covered or protected.* And the third *petition* of *access* to her majesty, restrain'd only to *weighty causes*, and when she was at *leisure*. I have not added the *quotations* of the *rolls* of *parliament*, in the particulars before-mention'd, for brevity sake; and because few readers can consult them; and they who are conversant in them, do know' all this. But they are ready when call'd for, upon any occasion, and more to the same purpose; which I suppose will not be deny'd by any body.

But I will quote a *book* which every one may consult, and which shews the different *methods* of management in *parliament* from what is now. It is *Cotton*'s *Abridgment of the Records*, &c. Revised by *William Prynne*. London *Printed* 1657. There you will find *petitions* and *bills* in *parliament*, whereof the *king* granteth *part*, and denieth *part*. p. 48, n. 12, n. 17, n. 19. p. 56, n. 24. p. 57, n. 30. p. 74, n. 16. p. 138, n. 177.

Again *granted* with *exceptions, addition, explanation*, or upon *condition*. p. 39, n. 34. p. 46, n. 44. p. 48, n. 14. p. 60, n. 45. p. 62, n. 57. Answer to the Articles of the Clergy, p. 33, n. 33. p. 70, n. 8. n. 19 p. 80, n. 29. p. 82, n. 15. p. 96, n. 12. p. 97, n. 19, p. 118, n. 20. p. 126, n. 67. p. 130, n. 109. p. 131, n. 113, 115. p. 132, n. 124. p. 140, n. 199 p. 159, n. 57. p. 152, at the end. p. 166, n. 131.

Now the use I have to make of these things, is to shew, that neither the *constitution* or *privileges* of *parliaments* are *original rights*, or *fundamentals*; but *variable* and *changeable*. Nor do they flow from the *people* at all, but are, and ever were the *concessions* and *grants* of *kings*, and nothing else.

And as to all these *limitations*, I now say, in direct answer to our *author*, that the king cannot be lawfully

limited

limited by the *people*. He cannot be limited but by himself, that is by the *law*, which is made by him, and cannot be made without him.

But now as to *limitations* of *coercion*. No *supreme power* can grant any such, because it *ipso facto* dissolves the *government*. For it sets up a *power* that is *superior* to the *supreme*, which is a *contradiction*. And the *supreme* does *ipso facto* cease to be *supreme*, and that other *superior* becomes *supreme*. And if power of *coercion* be given to *another* over that *superior*, that *other* becomes *supreme*; and so in *infinitum*. There can be no *basis* or *centre* of *government*, at this rate.

2. Limitations of coercion.

Therefore my lord *Bacon* sets this down as a *maxim* of our *law*, as well as of *reason*, that *suprema potestas seipsam dissolvere potest, ligare non potest*: That *the supreme power may dissolve itself, but cannot limit itself*. This is to be understood of *limitations* of *coercion*. For, no doubt, the *supreme power* may grant *concessions*; but not so, as to give any other *power* over itself; for that *dissolves* it.

Now as it is *absurd* and *blasphemous* to say, that *God* can *limit* himself, so as to put himself under the *coercive* power of any; so is it *treasonable* and inconsistent with *government* to say, that the *king* can. And this is sufficiently *secur'd* in the *acts* of *parliament* before quoted, which declare, that neither the *parliament*, nor the *people*, either *collectively*, or *representatively*, have any *coercive* power over the *king*.

My *father*, as my *king*, may *limit* the *power* he has over me, by *concessions* to me. But to say, that this infers a *coercive* power in me over him, so that if he breaks those *conditions* to me, as I think or please to pretend; I may lawfully lay hands upon him, turn him out of doors, and seize upon his *house* and *inheritance* for myself: This *principle* would *dissolve* all *relations*, as betwixt *children* and *parents*, so betwixt *king* and *subjects*, *servants* and *masters*, and in short, of whole *mankind*.

And

And this is the most effectual *bar* to hinder *kings*, *fathers*, or *masters*, to give any *concessions*, and introduceth a *necessity* of a *rigorous government*: Since no *favour* can be shew'd, without the *destruction* of the *donor*.

V. *The best security against tyranny.*

Therefore the best *security* we can have against *tyranny* in our *governors*, is, by a *dutiful submission*, to encourage them to be good to us. And by *loyal principles* to render them *safe* and *secure* in whatever *concessions* they shall please to give us. No man ever yet hated his own *flesh*, but loveth and cherisheth it. All men desire to preserve their *possessions*, and what *belongs* to them. The glory of a *king* is the *multitude*, the *riches*, and *strength* of his *subjects*. And while they are *true* to him, he must wish their *prosperity*.

But *provocations* and eternal *teazing*, the *disloyalty* and *rebellion* of *wives*, *children*, *servants*, and *subjects*, may make a man hate his own *house*, and seek all means to *reduce* them.

And this brings ten-fold more *ruin* and *destruction* upon them than ever any *people* suffer'd, by quietly submitting to the most merciless *tyrant*.

If they should *depose* their *king*, their new *protector* and *deliverer* may prove more *tyrannical* than he. And if they set up a new *captain* against their *deliverer*, he may prove *worse*: Besides, what every such new *experiment* must cost them. Till they come at last to say with the wretched *Sicilians*, as quoted in the second *Part* of *New Association* p. 33, 34. "that "they who came to deliver them from tyranny, prov'd "the greatest tyrants themselves, and made their free-"dom much more dismal than their former servitude."

But no *age* or *history* can afford us instances of this, beyond our own. I know none can equal the horrid *tyranny* and *oppression* of our *deliverers* and *patrons* of *liberty* in the *times* of *forty-one*.

Among

A notable instance of liberty and property.

Among the many particulars of which (too long to be here repeated) I will at present name but *one*, in the very *infancy* of their *rebellion*, when they were making the fairest *pretences* in the *year* 1642. A *committee* only of the *house* of *commons*, consisting of these worthy *patriots*, having first, by *authority* and *force* of their *mob*, *driven away* some and *imprisoned* others of the lawful *members* of their *house*, who they knew would stand by the *laws*; did assume to *themselves* the name of the *people* of *England*; and by an *ordinance* of their own, without *king* or *house* of *lords*, did impower *four* men of their own choosing, to *value* every man's *estate* at what they pleas'd; (except their own, the *taxing* of which they reserved to *themselves*) and to *levy* from them what *sum* they thought fit, within the *twentieth* part; (that is indeed what *sum* they pleas'd, for they could *value* at what they pleas'd) and for *non-payment* to *distrain* by the *train-bands*; and for want of sufficient *distress*, to *compound* and *discharge* all *debts* due to them; and if they suspected any to conceal the *debts* due to them, to *imprison* their *persons* during *pleasure*, and *banish* their *wives* and *children*. And these *four assessors* to be *unaccountable* to any *law* or *authority* whatsoever, only to their *constituents*; for they were now the *people!* that is, the *supreme authority?* This you will see at large in lord *Clarendon*'s history, *vol.* II. p. 77. Read from p. 75. to p. 82.

Here is an example of preserving *liberty* and *property* by the *power* of the *people!*

And all this, to secure themselves from the *encroachments*, and the *fears* they rais'd of the most *merciful* and *benign prince* that ever sat on the *English throne!* who granted away to them, by *piece-meal*, as they were pleas'd to *demand* it, all the *power* and *prerogative* of the *crown*; to *satisfy* their *jealousies*. But they were not *satisfied* while the *crown* sat upon his *head*, or his *head* upon his *shoulders!*

And

VI. *Whether the* unreasonableness *of* people, *or the* mal-administration *of* kings *are most to blame?*

And when we look into *history*, and find this to have been generally the *fate* of the most *mild* and *gracious princes*; it prompts us to reflect, with a general view, upon the condition of deprav'd *human nature*; and to consider whether the *cause* of more *rebellions* and *convulsions* of *government* has arisen from the *mal-administration* of *princes*; or from the *petulancy* and *unreasonableness* of the *people!*

And because we may be sure of right *information*, we will take it from the *sacred records*.

Moses.

Moses was the *meekest* man upon *earth*; so just, that he had never taken an *ox* or an *ass* from any of the *people*; gave them the wisest *laws* in the *world* from the *mouth* of *God* himself; was set over them by *God*; he *rescu'd* them from the *house* of *bondage*, by a multitude of *miracles*; had such a *fatherly* affection to them, as if he had *begotten* them all.

Deut. ix. 9. 18. 25.

Three several times he fell down before the *Lord*, forty *days* each time, without *eating* or *drinking*, *once* to receive the *law*, and *twice* to *deprecate* the *sin* of the *people*, for which *God* said he would have *destroyed* them, had not *Moses* his *chosen stood before him in the gap to turn away his wrathful displeasure from them.* He *prayed* to be *blotted* out of the *book* of *life* himself, to *save* that *people*; though *God* promised him, to raise out of him, a *greater nation* than they.

One would think it *impossible* for any *people* to *mutiny* or *rebel* against such a *governor* as this! Yet never any was so tormented as this *meek* man, with their continual *insurrections*. Insomuch that he pray'd to God to take away his *life*, rather than bear it. They laid *arbitrary government* upon him, and *ambition*, to *make himself altogether a* PRINCE *over them.* They did not like this *governor* of *God*'s appointment: They were

were for *popular election*. They would *chuse* for themselves. *And they said one to another, let us make a captain.* And what would they do with *Moses?* Why *stone* him!

They *rebelled* twice against *David*, a *man after God's own heart*, whose *son* CHRIST delighted to be call'd. *He fed them with a faithful and true heart, and ruled them prudently, with all his power.* He was *glorious* in *war*, and *subdued* their *enemies* under them. But all that was nothing! *Nay, but whom the Lord, and this people, and all the men of* Israel *choose, his will I be, and with him will I abide.* This is the first time we heard of that *maxim, vox populi, vox Dei.* That the *choice* of the *people* is the *choice* of *God!* David.

But if *David*'s reign was incumbered with *war*, though *victorious*, and that they had a mind to live at ease, his son *Solomon* (of *God*'s own *choosing* too) gave them perfect *peace* and *plenty* unparallelled; He advanced their *trade*; and made *silver* as *stones* in *Jerusalem*. They were the *envy of* all *nations* for *riches:* He built them a *temple*, the *glory* of the whole world; and was the *wisest* of all ever *begot* by *man*. Solomon.

Yet all this would not do! they complained of *taxes*, and his *yoke* was *heavy!* and they *rebelled* against his *house* for ever.

There is but one *step* higher to go in this *scale*; and that is to *God* himself. For after the *meekest* and *justest*, the most *pious* and *victorious*, the most *peaceable*, *richest*, and *wisest*, whom else of *mortal race* should we name! Theocrasie.

But *God* did once vouchsafe to take the *government* into his own hands, and to be *king* himself. He nam'd all their *captains* and *judges*, and went out before their *armies*. But they grew *weary* of this *theocrasie*, and in the days of *Samuel*, they *rejected* GOD too from being their *king!* and would *choose* for *themselves!* And of *all* they *chose*, not *one* prov'd *good*.

Now

Now let us look a little to the other side of the *perversenes* that is found among the *generality* of *mankind*. As we have seen how *uneasy* and *mutinous* they were under the most *mild* and *gentle governments*: So, on the other hand, where they are *ruled* with a *strait* rein, and even *tyrannically*, they commonly speak *best* of those *princes*, and *adorn* their *memories*.

How the *mild* family of the *Stuarts* have been treated since they came into *England*, I need not repeat.

And yet none of those *severities* can be alledg'd in any of their *reigns*, as were in those of *Hen.* VIII. or Q. *Elizabeth*.

That usage which either of them gave their *parliaments* would not be borne now. *Swearing* at them, and taking their *members* out of the *house*, and *imprisoning* them during pleasure, and not suffering any reason to be asked them for it. And yet king *Charles* I. but desiring *justice* against five of their *members*, was a *breach* of *privilege*, and a sufficient ground for a *rebellion*!

He courted the *fanaticks*, established them in *Scotland*, indulged them in *England*, and even made himself a *sacrifice* to them. Yet they *hate* his *memory*.

Q. *Elizabeth* prosecuted them with the utmost *rigor*, made severe *laws* against them, and put them in full execution. She reckoned them as her worst *enemies*, even worse than the *Jesuits* themselves, and to have been instrumental in the *Spanish invasion*. As you may see in the lord chancellor *Puckering*'s speech, which I have therefore *annexed*, N. 3. And yet they pretend to reverence her *memory*!

One cause of which I take to be, that when men are hindered from any *wickedness*, they are willing to take the *honour* to themselves, of never having *designed* it, but rather to have *suffered* under an unjust *suspicion*. Which use some of the *dissenters* late *books* have made of their patient *suffering* under Q. *Elizabeth* as a *testimony* of their *loyalty* and *passive obedience principle*, to *vie* therein with the *church* of *England*.

On

On the other hand, when men have *perpetrated* their *wickedness*, they think themselves obliged to stand by it, and justify it; and therefore must not afford a good word to those whom they have *injur'd*; for that is to condemn themselves. And herein is that *saying* verified, *that it is he who doth the injury, cannot forgive.*

Another reason there is for this *perverse temper* of *men*. That the *multitude* are like the *waters* (as they are often represented in the holy *scriptures*) which will go as far as they have way. And when they who bear the *sword* of *God*, will suffer pernicious *principles* to be *spread*, and the *populace* to rage and *swell*; as they are accountable to *God*, for bearing his *sword* in vain, and suffering his *authority*, with which they are *entrusted*, to be vilely *prostituted* to the *beasts* of the *people*: So they often let these bad *humours* increase, till they are *involv'd*; and seek to *extricate* themselves by mean *compliances*, which render them and their *authority* more and more *contemptible*; till at last it be *wrested* out of their hands; and they themselves often *perish* with it. For that *maxim* must for ever remain *irrefragable*, that it is in vain seeking to *compound* with those who *contend* for *power*. For the more they get, the more they must have, till they have all. Can one *exception* be produc'd!

Therefore Q. *Elizabeth* watched the beginnings of the *faction*, and kept them under, from so much as any *expectation* of coming into *places* of *power* or *trust*; and she had *peace* and *quietness* with them; and has their *good word* still.

But K. *Charles* I. endeavoured to *compound* with them, and *gave* them *part*, that they might not *seek* the *whole!* For which they *condemned* him as a *tyrant* and a *traytor*, and have his *memory* in *detestation!*

It had been much better for the *nation* to have had a rigorous *king* over them, than a *prince* though of never so many personal *vertues*, who, out of a mistaken *clemency*, should let *factions* grow to the *destruction* of the *people*.

A *tyrant*

VII. *Of* tyranny *and* revolution.

A *tyrant* must *die*, or may become *better*. God says, that the *hearts* of *kings* are in his hands, and he turns them, as it seemeth best to him. He sends *good kings* to a *good people*; and *wicked princes* for the *punishment* of a *wicked people*.

But when we have overturn'd the *foundation* of *government*; will let it be no longer from *God*, but set it up upon the *foot* of the *people*, which has no *foundation*; it is not for one *life* or *age* we may endure the effects of it! What did the *deposition* of *Richard* II. cost *England?* A train of *misery*, *blood*, and *destruction* for above an hundred Years, till the *right line* was at last *restor'd!* And was the difference betwixt *Richard* II. and *Henry* IV. worth all this? So that *tyranny* may last for a *life*; But *rebellion*, if it succeeds, for *ages*.

No *kingdom* was ever yet *destroy'd* by the *tyranny* of a *king*; but by *rebellion* many have.

Yet our *author* thinks *tyranny* much more destructive to the *people*, than *popular revolution*. And proves it thus, *p.* 18. "Let any one consider the cruelties that "have been inflicted upon the poor protestants in "*France*; not to mention the many illegal arbitrary "proceedings that we have seen in our own nation, "and compare them with the manner with which our "popular revolution was brought about, and try in his "conscience, if he can be of his (*the author of the* "*association*'s) opinion. And let any one reflect upon "the condition we must have been in before this time, "had not God come in to our rescue. And I am "sure it will be impossible for him to subscribe to such "downright falsities, and such slavish principles."

This *author* is still very *sure!* I first, except against the last part of the *comparison*, what he apprehends might have come to pass! *jealousies* and *fears* will bear no *argument*. A man may be as *fearful* as he pleases. There are some who *fly*, when none *pursueth*. And some pretend *dangers*, to *frighten* other folks; to raise *mobs*, and carry on *designs*.

But

But I desire to know what he means by *The many illegal and arbitrary proceedings that we have seen in our own nations?* I suppose he does not mean the *last reign*; therefore I will not mention it. It must then be the *two* former *reigns*; for we have seen none other.

By this *representation*, a *stranger* wou'd expect many men *massacr'd*, *dragoon'd*, *banish'd*, &c. in the *reigns* of king *Charles* II. and king *James* II. when this is brought in as a *balance* to the *destruction* that attends *popular revolutions*. But when he is told, That no one *man*, *woman*, or *child* can be produc'd in both these *reigns*, that did suffer otherwise than by the known *laws* of the *land*; not one *Gaffny'd* or *Glen-Coe'd*; but many *pardon'd*, and *repardon'd*, who had been in open *rebellion*, and detected in several *assassination plots*, to have *murder'd* the *king*, and *over-turn* both *church* and *state*; and this so fully *prov'd*, as to be *confessed* even by *themselves*: I say, when this is shew'd to be the case, as it truly is; What wou'd a *stranger* think, what shou'd *we* think (we are *strangers* to our selves!) of such *writers* as these, who blacken *princes*, whose *mercy* was their *fault* and their *ruin*, as if they had been the greatest *tyrants* in the world; when yet they have no one *instance* to shew of what they wou'd so *impudently* impose upon the world!

This reasonably *abates* the *credit* we are to give them, when they speak of *foreign* affairs, and bring no *proof*; yet I will not take that advantage, so as to wave that part of his *comparison*, which relates to the treatment of the *Hugonots* in *France*. Nor will I seek to *alleviate* or *lessen* it, by the known *principles* of these men as to *government*, and the *deposing* of *kings*; their former frequent *rebellions*; and those *discoveries*, which the *advocates* for the *French king* alledge he had made of their *treating* with *foreign powers*, in order to an *insurrection* in his own *kingdom*. I wave all this, nor will I undertake the *proof* of it.

Our *comparison* lies only as to the *number* of *men* that were *destroy'd* in this *French persecution*. I have heard

 much

much of the *dragooning* there; and it was very *barbarous*. I *detest* it. But I have not heard much of any put to *death* upon that account of *religion*, except of a few of their *ministers*, who being *banish'd* on pain of *death*, did *return*. But let the whole *detail* be made out, in the most *ample* manner, we will by no means *stint* them; and when they have agreed upon the *number*, with any sort of *probability*, I will give them leave to *multiply* it *ten-fold*; and then will enter upon the *comparison* of those who *perished*.——

Not in our late *revolution*, as this *author* wou'd fix it; no, I will not meddle with that: I allow that to be an *exception*; because it was *worth* all that it *cost* us! What was some *hundreds* of *thousands* that were *starv'd* to *death*, and fell by the *sword* in *Ireland*, in about *two years* time; besides *families* and *persons* that were *ruin'd*, without *number*! What were all those who *perish'd* in *Scotland*; and in our *ten-years-war* abroad, by *sea* and *land*! What was all this; besides about eighty *millions* in *taxes* (more than all our *kings* since *William* the *conqueror* had, put together.) What was all this, if it had been *ten* times more, in comparison of the *preservation* of our *laws* and *liberties*! But this I will say, that this is the first *popular revolution* that ever was worth the while!

Therefore I will carry our *comparison* higher, to the *former* of *forty-one*; and to that of *York* and *Lancaster*. And will double the advantage I before offer'd this *author*, as to the *number* of those who *perish'd* and were *ruin'd*, in either of these *revolutions*; compar'd with those who *perish'd* in the late *French persecution* of the *Hugenots*. And I will give this latest of the *Sevennois* into the bargain. Nay I will go further, and let him add to the account, the late *persecutions* of the *protestants* in *Hungary*, and in *Savoy*. So vast a *dis-proportion* there is betwixt *tyranny* and *revolution*! And so little reason has this *author* to call these things *downright falsities*, which are as *flagrant truth*, as the *sun* at *noon-day*! But none so *blind* as they who *will* not *see*.

As

As little ground had he, to call the *jure-divino* doctrines, *slavish principles*. For let these *doctrines* be *true* or *false*; it cannot surely be called so *slavish*, to submit my self to one *royally born*, sprung from the loins of many *kings!* whom I believe to be *invested* with a *divine commission*; and likewise better for the *salus populi*, and preservation of the public *peace* and *security*; and whose *heart*, *God* says, he keeps in his own *hand*; and that he will eternally *reward* those who *faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey such in him, and for him, according to his blessed word and ordinance, considering whose authority such an one hath*, that is *God's*. Now whether it is more *slavish* to *obey* such an one, for *conscience* towards *God*; or to put my self *creepingly* under the *feet* of the *beasts* of the *people*, of one upon the same *level* with my self, it may be, *worse born*; and who by *hypocrisie* and *trick*, has squeez'd himself into *power*, perhaps, by undermining *me*, who had the same *plot* upon *him!* And stands upon no other *foundation*, than a pack'd *party* who call themselves the *people*; to which I have as good *right*, if I can get a *party* to follow me; and so has every other, if he were my *foot-man*, or a *Massanello*, who can do the same: Whether is more *honourable*, or more *slavish*, to submit *tamely* under such an *one*, or, which is worse, a *mob* of them; without any *rules* of *law*, or *constitution*, but what they please to call so; and in opposition to all the *laws* of *God* and *man*; to the trampling down of all *nobility*, and *distinctions* of *men*; I leave it to any man of *honour* or *sense*, whether there is not more of *slavery* and *poornes* of *spirit* in *submitting* to such, than to a *king*, whom it is an *honour* to *serve*; and has been so reputed, in the whole *earth*, from the first *division* of *nations*, to this day; except among a set of *filthy dreamers*, who have of late years rose up in our *land*; *Who speak evil of the things they understand not; and are not afraid to despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities; whereas Angels dare not bring railing accusations against them*, tho'

VIII. Slavish principles.

wicked, tho' the *devil* himself! The *blessed angels* serve *willingly*, in the several *ranks* of that *hierarchy* wherein *God* has plac'd them: And this is their *perfect freedom*. The *devil* wou'd not *keep his first principality*, and is a *slave* in his *rebellion!* To *serve* a *nobler* than my self, is *honourable*; but to *serve* my *inferior*, or *equal*, is *slavish*. Happy is that *land* whose *king* is the *son* of *nobles*. And wretched are those *people*, over whom *servants* bear *rule*.

IX. *Of a* limited *and* mix'd *monarchy*.

Having thus dispatch'd these *popular objections* of our *author*; let us now pursue the *argument*, we have been upon; and conclude it with the explaining of some *words*, which are a *stumbling-block* to many, because not well understood; these are the *phrases* of a *limited* and *mix'd monarchy*, which are in every bodies mouth, and the burden of all our *republican* and *whig-pamphlets*.

They say, that *king*, *lords*, and *commons* are a *mixture* of *monarchy*, *aristocrasie*, and *democrasie*, all together. For that the *supreme power* is *divided* between them. Thence they raise their *balancing* of *power*, between these *three supremes*. Of which sufficient has been said before, that it is *nonsense* and *contradiction*. That *power* is *one*, and therefore cannot be *divided*, &c.

But must there be no *limitation* then, or *mixture* of *monarchy?*

Mixture can be none. That cannot be in the *nature* of the *thing*. All the *mixture* is this, That the *lords*, who are the *aristocratical* part, and the *commons*, who are the *democratical*, do both compose the *king's* great *council* of the *parliament*. Which is an excellent and wise *disposition*. As it is said, *In the multitude of councellors there is safety*. But then the *supreme power* is only in the *king*, not in these *three kings*. As it is likewise said, *For the wickedness of a land, many are the princes thereof*. One *king*, and many *councellors*. That is the *safest*. And it is our *constitution*.

Dismissing then this *mixture* of *government*, let us come to the *limitations*.

May

May not a *monarch* be *limited?* Yes, as said before, he may *limit* himself, by *limitations* of *concession*. And, in this sense, ours is the most *limited*, and consequently the most *happy* government in the world; if we know our own *happiness*, and will be *content* with it.

But as to *limitations* of *coercion*, the *king* cannot *limit* himself, nor be *limited* by any other: For that moment the *government* is *dissolv'd*; and nothing but *confusion* can follow. And our laws have sufficienly secur'd against any *limitation* of *coercion*, as before has been shew'd.

In the next place I will say, that no *commonwealths*, or what they call *popular governments*, (tho' no such ever truly was, or can be in the world) have granted such *limitations* of *concession*, as *monarchs*, at least *ours*, have done. And no *subjects* in the world may be so *easie* and *happy* as we; if that *rebellious principle* of *coercing* our *kings*, and making ourselves *co-ordinate* with him, were once rooted out from among us; if we wou'd be guided either by *reason*, or *scripture*, the *law* of the *land*, or, the *experience* of all *ages*, chiefly of *our own*. Till when, *peace* and *settlement* will be as impossible to us, as to reconcile *contradictions*.

And without reflecting upon one or another *party*, considering them only as *men*, where there is a *contest* for *power*, one or the other must have it. And there can never be any *settlement* in such a *state* of things; or any *government* fix'd without a certain *foundation*, *centre*, and ultimate *arbitrator*; which can never be the *people*. They are the *party* to be *govern'd*; and therefore cannot be the *governors*.

And now we have seen all that is said in this *Occasional Letter* against the *principles* laid down in the *New Association*. I cou'd take advantage of several *expressions*; but all I aim at is to settle *principles*. And I shall be glad if any will shew me, wherein I have *reason'd* amiss; or mistaken the sense of the *holy scriptures*; or of our own *laws* and *constitution*; or in matter of *fact*, as to the dreadful *consequences* of these *popular* principles, which take *government* from off the *foundation* of *divine*

right and *establishment*; and place it upon the *face* of the *waters*, upon the giddy *multitude*, perpetually *ebbing* and *flowing*, and raised up into *storms* and *tempests*, by every *breath* of *seditious* spirits to their own destruction, and overthrow of all *order*, *laws*, and *constitution*.

X. Character given of the New Association.

And the endeavouring to settle sure and lasting *foundations* of *government*, in opposition to these *popular* no *principles*, of *sedition* and eternal *confusion*, is all the reason I know that has stir'd up the *wrath* of these *orators* for the *populace*. And it is a sufficient *reason*, in one sense, that while they are resolv'd not to *repent*, they wou'd not be *inform'd*, nor have others to be set *right*. And if the *principles* of *government* before-mention'd, of a *divine original* and *right*, cannot be *disprov'd*; nor the other supported, of founding it upon the *people*, then the *temple* of the *republican dagon* tumbles down all at once; and *restless* spirits are *disarm'd* of their main and perpetual *pretence* for stirring men up to *sedition* and *rebellion*. This is it which makes them so *angry*, so exceedingly *concern'd* at all *discourses* of this nature; and to treat the *authors* with so much the more *rage* and *malice*, the less they find themselves able to answer them.

It was this, which made the *Occasional Letter* p. 7, call the *New Association*, *The most malicious and virulent book of the age*: And tell the *author*, that he deserves the *pillory*. And again, *p.* 25, 26. *This writer has the best way of turning every thing, without any prejudice to a party, just to his own humour, of any man I ever met with.*

But Sir, there is an easy *receit* for this, and is no such *master-piece* in that *author*. There goes no more to it than this, to fix true *principles*, from which it is easy for any man to argue; and to have no other *humour* or *design*, than to find out the *truth*; and then, *every thing will turn just to his own humour*; and that *without any prejudice to a party*, while he only battles their *principles*;

principles; and thereby endeavours to reclaim them from their evil *practices*: Which likewise he *may* and *ought* to lay before them, *fully* and *freely*, to deter them the more from *relapsing* into them. And all this, without any *prejudice* to them. No. It is the greatest kindness can be shew'd to them. Much greater than to *sooth* and *palliate*, and *excuse* them! And if any will *harden* themselves against all *conviction*, and return nothing but *railing* and *Billingsgate* to whatever *reasons* or *arguments*; and seek to *pervert* others, by *corrupting* the *right ways* of *truth*; such are to be rebuk'd *sharply*, to save others from their *infection*: Especially when the *support* or *ruin* of a *nation* depends upon it.

Concerning the education of children. Serm. 2.

Arch-bishop *Tillotson* said very well, "That we must not use mildness in "the case of a willful and heinous sin, "especially if it be exemplary, and of "publick influence. To rebuke gently upon such an "occasion, is rather to countenance the fault, and "seems to argue that we are not sensible enough of "the enormity of it, and that we have not a due dis-"like, and detestation for it." Such cold reproofs as those which old *Eli* gave his sons, 1 *Sam.* ii. 23, 24. Why do you such things? for I hear of your evil dealing by all this people. *That is, their carriage was such as gave publick scandal*: Nay, my sons, it is not a good report that I hear, you make the Lord's people to transgress. "Such a cold reproof as this, where the "crime was so great and notorious, was a kind of al-"lowance of it, and a partaking with them in their "sin; and so God interprets it.

And so no doubt he will, if we give allowance to the *witch-craft* of *rebellion*, and *partake* with it, by such *mild* and *gentle reproofs*, as seem rather to *countenance* or *excuse* it: And not to give men a due *horror* and *detestation* of so *destructive* a *wickedness*, for which they will *receive to themselves damnation*; and which hurries them to their own destruction, and of the whole *community*

with them! This sin ought to be *painted* out in its proper *colours*; the wicked *nature*, and dismal *consequences* of it should be expos'd to the full, that it be not thought a *small* and *indifferent* thing.

Occasional Letter. *p.* 8.

To this there is a strange *answer* given, *That if this faction are so implacable in their principles, if they enter into associations that are treasonable by law*, and *if they have* done such and such things, which are there set down, and quoted out of the *New Assoc.* —— Well, what then? What *inference* does he draw from it? Do's he deny any of these things? Or say, That they are *falsly* charg'd? No. He says not a word against the *truth* of the *charge*. For the *associations* are set down *verbatim* in the *New Assoc.* And the whole *charge* prov'd in every particular, past the possibility of a *denial*; and this *author* do's not *deny* one word of it; but makes this *inference*, as the plain design of the *New Assoc.* viz. "That the government, for its own security, and "for recompensing them that they have deserved, should "order gallows to be erected, and without more ado "should have them all hang'd." And calls to mind again the *Shortest Way*. They are still fond of that *precious* piece! *guilty conscience!*

But the *New Assoc.* is so far from intending any thing of this *hanging* business, that he expresly clears himself from it; and shews his meaning to be no more than not to trust them with the *power* of acting their former *mischiefs* over again. And no *answer* is given to that in this *Occasional Letter*. But the objection repeated over again, that nothing but *hanging* was the design! Nay, it is said, *That it is a very plain and necessary inference.*

Now, by this way of argument, if that *author* had quoted *Rom.* xiii. 2. That *they who resist shall receive to themselves damnation*, then it had been as *plain* and *necessary* an *inference*, that he design'd their *damnation* as well as *hanging*, because they *deserv'd* both.

At

At this rate, no man must preach *sin* to be *damnable!* Nor tell the *people* of their *sins*, lest he be thought to have a *design* to *damn* them all!

We have been told of another *association*, since those mention'd in the *New Assoc.* (and it is given us likewise *verbatim*) by some of the same *faction*; and *affix'd* up *publickly* upon the *market-cross* of a *royal borough*, at *noon-day*, by about *seven hundred* men in *arms*, in the name of all the true *presbyterians* in *Scotland*; and order'd to be *dispersed* all over the *kingdom*; wherein they renounce queen *Ann*, in express words, because she had promis'd to support *episcopacy* in *England*; which having been once a *covenanted kingdom*, they will have it so again, to the peril of their *lives*, and all that they have.

Wolf stripp'd. Append. *N.* 2.

Now, is not this *treason?* Must it not therefore be mention'd? Tho' to no other purpose, than to keep the *sword* out of the *hands* of *people* so *principl'd*; and not to trust them with the *power*, who have all along given abundant demonstration, that they want not the *will* to *destroy* us, our *church* and *government!* I say, must not this be mention'd, without a *design* to have them all *hang'd!* Is there not such a thing as *repentance*, and *amendment*, upon the full discovery of false and pernicious *principles?* Or, if they be past that, to secure what others we can from falling into their *snares?* Or lastly, That the *church* and the *monarchy* shou'd stand upon their *guard*, and *watch* such restless *spirits*, and inveterate *enemies* to both? Must we have a *design* to *destroy* them, except we give them *leave* to *destroy* us?

Here is an invincible *asylum* to all *rebellion*, and to *blacken* any who speak against it; that they are *cruel* and *mercileſs* men, who have a *design* against the *lives* of those they call *rebels!* Tho' the *proofs* be never so *flagrant*, and the *principle* justified by *them* all, by every *one* of *them*, without *exception*; and *propagated* in *print*, all over the *nation*, to *poison* it, and to *ruin* bring. And the *principle* of *loyalty*, and patient *submitting* for

conscience sake, on account of any *divine character* or *authority* in *kings*, is by these men made the *jest* and *hatred* of the *people*. And they who are for *peace* and settl'd *government*, are called *persecutors*, and *tyrannical*, because they fear *God* and the *king*, and *meddle not with those who are given to change!* Now whether their *arguments* be good or not, yet it is certain their *design* is *peace* and *quietness*, and rather to *suffer* injuries, than to *offer* them: And it is what they are persuaded is the best for *salus populi*, and attended with much less *ruin* and *destruction* to the *community*, than what they suffer by *popular revolutions*. Yet this is called a *bloody* and *tyrannical principle*, whereas that of *rebellion* and perpetual *innovations*, is call'd *generous*, and likewise *merciful*, tho' it destroy one *half* of the *people*, to preserve the *rest*; and *sacrifice* to every prevailing *faction*, the *lives*, *liberties*, and *properties* of the whole *nation*, with all its *laws* and *constitution!*

Now as a *sample* of these two *sorts* of men, let us look into these two *books* here before us. The *New Assoc.* having prov'd the *whigs* and *dissenters* to have been formerly *perfidious*, *designing*, and *rebelling*, *and enemies to church and state*, carries the consequence no farther than not to have them intrusted with the *power* to act all this over again: But the *Occasional Letter* says, p. 28. *And indeed were they as bad as he has describ'd them, I could not but think that hanging or banishment is what they well deserv'd, and what the common safety required.*

Now as to his suppose, whether they were so bad, *perfidious*, *designing*, and *rebellious*, the *proof* is hard matter of *fact*, which will not be *deny'd!* And tho' this *author* and other of their *advocates*, do deny the *charge* in the *whole*; yet they answer not the *particulars*, nor can *deny* any *one* of them.

But this shews how they would deal with those whom they esteem their *enemies*, as the *high church*, &c. if it were in their power; to make *root* and *branch work* with *episcopacy*, according to the maxim in their *private academies*;

academies, which Mr. *Wesley* has shewn in his *letter* concerning them, and the *defence* of it, lately *printed for* R. Clavel, *and* R. Knaplock *in* St. Paul's Church-yard, 1704. Which are well worth the reader's perusal, and the consideration of our *superiors*.

XI. *Of the Calves-head feasts.*

This *Occasional Letter*, p. 29, falls upon the *author* of the *New Assoc.* for mentioning the *calves-head feasts*, and joins with him in the same accusation, the *author* of the *dedication* of the *second volume of the lord* Clarendon's *history*, and replies smartly upon him, thus, " The " author of that dedication might indeed know of pub- " lick musick and rejoicing on that day, at *Oxford*, " where his dedication was printed. But if any where " else such rejoicings or feastings have been practis'd " on that solemn day, these gentlemen might know, " that the party at whose door such impiety is laid, " abhor, and dis-own it as much as themselves.

Here is *scandal* thrown, no matter whom it hits. As to the *publick rejoicings* at *Oxford*, I leave the *author* to *explain*, and the *persons concern'd* to *answer*. I will only say for the present, that this comes from a *party*, to whom *slander* is no new thing, especially when thrown in *innuendo's*, which they know sufficient to those with whom they have to do.

But I observe he do's not put *feasting* into his *Oxford-accusation*, and as for *musick*, that is not always a sign of *rejoicing*. There are *lamentations*, and *penitential psalms*, and *psalms* are usually sung at *executions*. But he calls it *publick musick*. Why? Was it at the *Theatre*? But tho' *feasting* be not in the *premises*, he has slid it into the *conclusion*, to make the *charge* full and round! For he says, *If any where else such rejoicings or feastings have been practis'd*, &c. Which implies, they were practised there; unless he thinks to come off, when question'd, by the particle, *or*, which may refer to *one* or *both*. If so, it was more *artful* than *honest*. And if the *evening* of a *fast day* be clos'd up with answerable *musick*, is that equal to the making it a *feast day*?

But how do's he come to make an *If* of it? *If any where else.*——As if he had never heard one tittle of these *calves-head feasts*, which are so notorious in *London*, their *history* and *anthems* printed, and have been continued from that *fatal* day to this! One would fancy this not wrote by an *Englishman!*

But it is a happiness every man is not born to, to *believe*, *see*, and *hear*, just as he *pleases!*

But this *author* further says, *That the party at whose door such an impiety is laid, abhor and dis-own it.*

First, as to the *party* he supposes concern'd, he must *know* them very well, else he could not so frankly *undertake* for them. And they are the same whose *principles* brought to pass the dismal *tragedy* of that *day*. And they seem more consequential to themselves, who *avow* both the *principle* and the *fact* pursuant to it, than they who still *defend* the *principle*, but would *dis-own* the *effects* of it.

For, Sir, you must know, that it is not the *meat*, but the *principles* of those *feasts*, which render them so *detestable*; that is, the *deposing doctrine*, and setting up the *power* of the *people* above the *king*. For if those *principles* be true, that *king died* by the *sentence* of his proper *judges* and *superiors*. And *justly* too, for *denying* of their *supream authority*, and refusing to be *try'd* by it.

Now, Sir, if you please to *examine* over that *party* for whom you have *vouch'd*, and see how many of *them* will renounce their *calves-head-principles.*——And all the rest are of the *club*, whether they come to their *feasts* or not. By this *test* we shall find whether this *calves-head-club*, consists only of a *few* profligate *men*, as this *author* represents it, or of *those in general, who are represented under the name of* WHIGS, whose *principles* he undertakes to vindicate, and says, *They are entirely for our monarchy, as by law establish'd, and for all that allegiance to kings and queens, which the law of God and man requires.* How far the *deposing-doctrine* is consistent with these, has been spoke to before, and particularly

cularly as to the *laws* of the *land*, expreſt in full and very particular *acts* of *parliament*, yet *unreveal'd*, as to any *coercive* power over the *king*, in the *people*, either *collectively* or *repreſentatively*. So that if we will be determin'd by the *laws*, the *laws* have determin'd us: And if we fly higher, to the *original* of *nations* upon the *earth*, then we hope from the next *Occaſional Letter* (ſince we are to have more, for this is but *Numb.* 1.) a *clearer* and more *certain* account of it than what is before given. Till which be done, it is not a *few profligate*, but the whole *body* of the *whigs*, that lie under the *imputation*. And they are deſir'd to ſhew, how they *have always deteſted the barbarous murther of king* Charles I. (as this author ſays) while they *have always* maintain'd the very ſame *principles*, which (more *guiltily* than the *Ax*) cut off his *head!* And which ſtill do *threaten* all *kings* and *queens* that ever ſhall wear the *crown* in *England!* And which actually paſs the ſame *ſentence* upon all who are not *better* than that bleſſed *martyr!* Who are not more *vertuous*, more *pious* than he! More *willing*, more *ready* to give up their *prerogative*, and grant *conceſſions*, to whatever prevailing *party* pretend to *act* in the *name* of the *people!* or, who obſtinately, like him, ſhall deny the *authority* of theſe their *conſtituents*, to call them to *account*, to *adjudge* the *crown* from off their *heads*, or their *heads* from their *ſhoulders!* For that is the higheſt *treaſon* and *rebellion* any *king* can commit againſt his *ſovereign lord* the *people!* It is a downright *diſowning* of their *authority*, and *uſurping* it to himſelf! It is a making *them* his *ſubjects*, inſtead of his being *ſubject* unto *them!*

Now when the *whigs* call it a *barbarous murther* in the *people*, to put ſuch a *king* to *death*; and yet maintain the ſame *principle* upon which they did it; it is impoſſible *both* ſhou'd be *true*, becauſe they are *contradictions*; and in which of them they play the *hypocrite* is eaſily diſcern'd; while they *act* upon the one, the *principle* of *power* in the *people*, openly *aſſert* and *defend* it; and *perſecute* thoſe who deny it, as *diſaffected*,

ed, seditious, and which is worse, as *high-church-men!* But their acknowledgments to the *martyr*, is only in *words*, and that very *short*, a passing *expression* or so, for *popularity* sake, since it is the *fashion*; but without any *reason* given for it, or so much as saying, That he did not deserve to *die*, who denied, and refus'd to *submit* himself to the *supreme power* of the *people*. Such *Crocadile-tears* as they bestow upon the *hearse* of the *martyr*, while they justify the *fact* in all its consequences, is a more outragious and provoking *mockery*, than the bare-fac'd *impudency* of the *calves-head-feasts!*

But if there are any indeed of so very weak a judgment, as to think that they can pay a just *veneration* to the *memory* of the *martyr*, and yet retain the *principle* of *power* in the *people*; this is to let them see, that they must part with *one*, for they cannot serve two such *masters*.

I am told, that last 30th of *January*, at one of the principal of their *calves-head-feasts* here in *London*, they used a sort of a *symbolical ceremony*, of *sticking* their *knives*, all at once, into the biggest of the *calves-heads*, thereby engaging themselves in a *band* of *unity*, for the *restauration* of *pust*, that is, their *commonwealth*; and the *extirpation* of *monarchy*, especially in the *line* of the *martyr*, whom they thus represented. And in one of their *poems* since published, this year 1704. intituled, *Faction display'd, The second Part*, which deserves its room among their *anthems*, they speak it out as plainly, p. 21. where justifying the *deposition* of the late King *James* II. they say,

I own the right an injur'd nation did,
When she from Rome *her threaten'd* altars *freed.*
Applaud the just and more approv'd design,
Of quite exploding that detested line.

Is not this fair *warning* (in *print*, and cry'd about the *streets*) to his *daughter*, now sitting upon his *throne!*

When

When any person is dear to us, we use to *embalm* his *memory*, and cannot seek occasions to bespatter and revile him, as this author does, though he says he does it not, *p.* 9, 10. Where coming to answer the *abolition* of *episcopacy* in *Scotland*, and the cruel usage the *clergy* met with there in the last reign; he *confesses* the *charge*, for it was not to be *deny'd*; and the only method he could find to *lessen* the *weight* of it, was, to lay *load* much more *heavily* against king *Charles* the *first*, for the same, and says, that what he advances *p.* 10. *sets off king* William's *management of the affair to better advantage than that of his royal grandfather*'s. Of which the reader shall judge, when I have offered these few considerations, not to aggravate against the *grandson*, but to do justice to the *memory* of the *royal grandfather*.

XII. *This author's reviling the* memory of *king* Charles *the* martyr.

I grant this to be the greatest and most fatal *blot* in that *good* king's reign; but he severely *repented* of it, and *aggravates* it against himself. Thus says he to God in his confession, *Was it through ignorance that I permitted a wrong way of thy worship to be set up in* Scotland, *and injur'd the bishops in* England? *O no; but with shame and grief, I confess, that I therein followed the persuasions of worldly wisdom, forsaking the dictates of a right informed conscience; wherefore, O Lord, I have no excuse to make, no hope left, but in the multitude of thy mercies.*——I hope this author will be able to produce to us as truly *christian* and *heroical* a *confession* of the *grandson*'s, and then it would be very wicked, and a *breach* of *charity* to remember his *sin* any more, to his *disadvantage*.

But the *grandfather* expressed his *repentance* in more than words, for he *seal'd* it with his *blood*; and chose rather to lose his *head*, than consent to such another *act* of *abolition* of *episcopacy* in *England*. Whether his *grandson* might not have done the same, if

if it had come to the trial, I will not ſay, but leave it to this *author*, to give us what *indexes* of it he has obſerved: becauſe he ſpeaks of himſelf, as one let into his moſt ſecret councils, for he ſays, *p.* 10. *I have great reaſon to be confident he* (K. Will.) *had ſuch a deſign* of reſtoring epiſcopacy in *Scotland*, *if ever he could have had it in his power to have effected it.* Now whatever *reaſon* this *author* had to be *confident* of *K. W.*'s *deſign*, which I will not aſk, for I care not to be intruſted with *ſecrets*; yet he would oblige the world to let us know why it was not in his *power* to have *effected* it! When the firſt *rabble-preſbyterian-convention* was continued all his *reign*, againſt all the *ſolicitations* could be made to give the *nation* a free *election*. And why were the *biſhops* turned out, and the *epiſcopal clergy rabbled* and *diſpoſſeſſed*, before the *oaths* were put to them, or known which of them would *ſwear* to the *government*, or not?

He ſays *(ibid.)* that *K. W. made no grants of the church lands in Scotland.* This was his *ignorance* or his *innocence!* for when her preſent *majeſty* had piouſly deſigned to apply the *biſhops revenues* in *Scotland* towards the ſupport of the ſurviving *biſhops*, and *deprived epiſcopal clergy* there, it has been found upon enquiry, that almoſt the whole of them have been *granted* away, and that even by act of *parliament*, to *laymen* there, ſo that there is but a *pittance* left for her *majeſty* to diſpoſe of. While Mr. *Carſtares*, who was in the *Rye-Houſe conſpiracy*, enjoys the whole revenue of the *biſhoprick* of *Dunblane*, by grant from K. *William*.

XIII. What will pleaſe the diſſenters:

But from the whole of this *ſtory*, there is a uſeful *leſſon*, to ſhew what it is will *pleaſe* ſome ſort of people; for when K. *Charles* I. had *granted* all that they did *deſire*, or could invent for their *ſecurity*, even to the *abolition* of *epiſcopacy*, and, as this *author* quotes my lord *Clarendon*'s hiſtory, *Whatſoever elſe they were pleaſed to preſent to him, concerning church or ſtate——ſo that he ſeemed to have made that progreſs into* Scotland, *only that he might make a perfect deed of gift of that kingdom*; inſomuch that

that they *declared* they had no more to *ask*, and that he left them, as the phrase then went, a *contented king* from a *contented people*; and on that occasion renewed their *vows* and *assurances* of perpetual *loyalty*, &c. yet all the use they made of these *condescentions* of his *majesty*, and the *power* which he had put into their *hands*, was to raise an *army* against him, and follow him into *England*, in conjunction with their *good brethren* there, who were in *rebellion* against him; and *declaring* that they would not be satisfied till the same thing was done in *England*, that *episcopacy* should be *abolished*, and the whole *power* put into the hands of the *faction* there, as has been done in *Scotland*. Which you may see in the said lord *Clarendon*'s history, *Vol.* II. *p.* 283, 292, 295, *&c.*

This shews how far any *party*, that contends for *power*, will be contented with a certain *share* of it!

Yet the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*, even then when they were at the highest in the *reign* of K. *Charles* I. and afterwards, when having *murdered* him, they had the whole *government* in their own hands, did not in all that time go the length that they have done now in *Scotland*, to make it *high-treason* to *speak*, *act*, or *write* in the defence of *episcopacy*, or against *presbyterian* government in the *church*.

The proceeding of the parliament of Scotland, 1703 printed 1704, p. 20.

So that we see, as men grow *older*, they grow *wiser* in *mischief*, as well as in *virtue!* We say *use* makes *perfect*; and the longer men have *practised rebellion*, they come to their work more *expeditely!* These men have already issued *declarations*, renouncing Q. *Anne* (as before is mentioned) because she has promised to support *episcopacy* in *England*, into which they are resolved to bring their *covenant*, and *presbytery*, as they did before; which their *predecessors* in *forty-one*, did not so much as pretend to, in the beginning of their *insurrection*. Their party was not then so well *fixed*, nor had that *power* in *England*, as they think they have *now!*

But

XIV. How far the whigs and dissenters were concerned in the murder of K. *Charles* I.

But leaving this melancholy subject to the *wisdom* of our *superiors*, I go on to examine the ground and foundation of the *whig-loyalty*, which this author insists upon, that they *have always detested the barbarous murder of K. Char.* Some of the *presbyterians*, though not many, have spoke against it; and on that head have endeavoured to represent themselves as *loyal* men; therefore it is fit every reader should know the truth of that matter, which is this;

That some time before the *murder* of K. *Charles* I. the *independent* party, and *Oliver* at the head of them, had *out-tricked*, and *wormed-out* the *presbyterians*, by the like *artifices*, as they before *outed* the *cavaliers*: this enraged the *presbyterians* beyond all measure, to find themselves *over-witted* and *supplanted*, by those whom they had taught to *rebel*. And as great *violence* was shewed by these *parties* against one another (calling each other *sectaries*, *perfidious*, *treacherous betrayers* of the *rights* of the *people*, &c.) as either of them had before spewed out against the *church* or the *crown*.

In this falling out of *thieves*, the *church* gained so much, that those arguments which she had made use of against the *presbyterians*, of causeless *separation*, and breaking the *unity* of the *church*, were urged by the *presbyterians*, with greater *violence* against the *independents*, whom they called *sectaries*, disturbers of the *peace* of *Jerusalem*, &c. And on the other hand, all the *pretences* which the *presbyterians* had set up against the *bishops*, of assuming *spiritual jurisdiction*, and *lording* it over their *brethren*, were retorted with advantage, by the *independents* against the *presbyterians*, and their *classical* constitution, whose *little finger* was shewed to be *thicker* than the *loins* of *episcopacy*.

And as to the *king*, each endeavoured to blacken the other with that part of the *rebellion*, which was *separately* their *share*. The *presbyterians* laid the king's *death* upon the *independents*. The *independents* said, they *killed* no *king*;

king; that the *presbyterians* had long before *un-kinged* him, and *despoiled* him of all *marks* of *royalty*, had reduced him perfectly to a *private* person, and carried him up and down a *prisoner*, for the *shew* of the *people!* that the *independents* had indeed, at last, *mumped* the *presbyterians* of him, and made their own advantage of this *royal sacrifice*, which the *presbyterians* had designed; and were now *enraged* to see others, and their *younger brother*, reap the *fruit* of all their *labours*.

Upon this head, it is not to be forgot, which is told in the *New Assoc.* Par. 2. p. 25. but nothing replied to it in this *Occasional Letter*, that the *general assembly* of the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*, did, by their *declaration*, dated *July* 31, 1648, condemn the resolution of the *Scots parliament*, which still remained so *loyal*, as to raise an *army* for the *rescue* of the *king* out of the hands of his *murderers*; which they did, and sent it into *England*, under the command of *duke Hamilton*; this was commonly called, the *duke*'s *engagement*, which *engagement*, the *general assembly*, by their *declaration* aforesaid, did call an *unlawful engagement*, and *thundered* out their *anathema*'s against it; as they afterwards, when the *king* was *murdered*, put all those to *open penance*, with the utmost *rigour*, who had been concerned in it, to shew, that they were no way *aiding* or *assisting* to his *death!* But the very next *day* after this their *declaration* against the *duke*'s *engagement*, *viz.* On the *first* of *August*, 1648, they issued a *declaration and exhortation to their brethren in England*, wherein they address themselves to the *king* in these words, *Albeit your majesty, through the suggestions of evil men, may haply entertain hard thoughts of us, and our proceedings, yet the searcher of hearts knows, and our consciences bear record unto us, that we bear in our spirits those humble and dutiful respects of your majesty that loyal subjects owe to their native sovereign; and that it would be our greatest contentment upon earth, to see your majesty reigning*, &c.

And as if this had not been enough, they, *eleven* days after, *viz.* on the 12th of the same *August*, 1648, sent

ſent their *humble ſupplication* to the *king*, wherein they tell him, *That they were very ſenſible of his majeſty's ſufferings and low condition; that they did not in the leaſt meaſure approve, but from their hearts abhor any thing that had been done to his majeſty's perſon, and that they did not oppoſe his majeſty's reſtitution to the exerciſe of his royal power*, &c.

And yet, at the ſame time, they *proteſted* againſt his *majeſty*'s being admitted to come to any of his *houſes* in or near *London*, with *freedom*, *honour*, and *ſafety*, as they had *ſtipulated* for him, when they had *ſold* him (for it was the *preſbyterian faction* only, and not the *nation*, which did it) or for concluding any *treaty* or *agreement* with him till he had firſt taken the *covenant*, aboliſhed *epiſcopacy* in *England*, as he had done in *Scotland*, turned out all whom they called *malignants*, that is, all his *friends* who had been *true* to him, and put the whole *power* into the hands of the *godly*, who had raiſed the *rebellion* againſt him!

I have tranſcribed this out of *New Aſſoc.* becauſe no notice is taken of it in the *Anſwer*. And perhaps there is not to be found in *hiſtory* ſuch another inſtance of *perfidy*, and ſanctified *hypocriſy!* except in what I am next to tell you, of their dealing with K. *Charles* II. of which they ſtill continue to *boaſt!*

If K. *Charles* I. would have turned *preſbyterian*, have deſtroyed the *church*, and revenged the *preſbyterians* upon the *independents*, then the *preſbyterians*, having no other game to play, would have let him *live* a little longer, till they could have done their buſineſs without him, and ſet up their *commonwealth* in the *ſtate* as well as the *church*.

And I doubt not but the *independents* would have done the ſame, if they had been *hewed* down by the *preſbyterians*, and that they could have made the *king* a *tool* to have ſet them in the *ſaddle* again. The like would the *anabaptiſts*, or any other of the then *ſectaries* have done, if it had been their caſe; and have had as much cauſe to *boaſt* of their *loyalty* as the *preſbyterians!* But the *deſtruction* of the *church* was the *cauſa ſine qua non* with them all.

all. None of them would have the *king* preſerved upon any other *terms*. They all agreed in that *point*, though they *quarrelled* with one another, about *dividing* of the *ſpoil*, and ſetting up their own different *models*. But *epiſcopacy* was their *common enemy*.

Let the *diſſenters* of ſeveral ſorts divide the *murder* of the *king* among them; they were all *guilty* of it. The *preſbyterians* began the *rebellion* againſt him, and brought him to the *block*; and juſt as they were ready to ſtrike the *ſtroke*, the *independents* ſnatched the *axe* out of their hands, and did it themſelves. There is no difference betwixt *rebellion* and *regicide*, the one is in order to the other. In vain therefore do theſe *rebels* lay the *murder* of the *king* upon one another! one *diſarms* him; another *binds* him; and a third *cuts* his *throat!* which are moſt *guilty?* even all alike! however, it is among the *diſſenters* and *whigs*. If it was not they, who elſe did it? I hope they will not ſay it was the *biſhops*, or the *cavaliers*. That it was the *church* which led them into *this* too! Their *diſowning* of this *fact* renders them *ſelf-condemned* as to all the *pretences* of their *rebellion*, that eſpecially of the *power* in the *people*, which was the *foundation* of all the reſt; for that *principle* muſt either *juſtify* the *regicide*, or *condemn* the *rebellion*. Their pretences to *loyalty* have involved them paſt all poſſibility of eſcape! A *half-faced rebel* can never hold it out. They ſtand ſurer, when they own the *whole truth*, that they are *thorough-paced*, even to the *height* of the *calves-head-club*; for then they have ſome *principle* to go upon, be it *true* or *falſe*. And we know, that many *well-meaning* men have been *ſeduced*, through *weakneſs* of *judgment* by falſe *principles*, and ſpecious *pretences*. But when they come to ſee their *error*, they return *wholly* and *heartily*, and not by *halves*; they have an *indignation* againſt themſelves, for their former *evil* courſes, and endeavour to make *amends*. They do not *palliate* or *excuſe*, but rather *aggravate* their *guilt*. This is the condition of all true *penitents*. And there is nothing more *Chriſtian*, or more *glorious!* But a ſnivelling

Laodi-

Laodicean, who will neither *own* his *principle*, nor *disown* it; who would keep his *principle*, but would not be answerable for the *effects* of it; such an one is the *contempt* and *hatred* of *God* and *man*, and fit only to be *spewed* out of their *mouth*, out of all *conversation* and *esteem!* especially when not *forced* to it by *hardships* and *persecution*; for though there is no *excuse* for *sin*, yet great *allowances* must be made for *human infirmities*, by those who are likewise in the *flesh*, lest they themselves also be *tempted*, But there is no such *temptation* now in the way of our *presbyterians*, to expose their guilty *loyalty* in the year 1648. And to *re-print*, as they have just now done, a *sheet* they say was *printed* then, entituled, *The Dissenting Ministers Vindication of themselves from the horrid and detestable Murder of* K. Charles *of glorious Memory*; re-printed 1704, where, p. 5. they lay the *cause* of the *miseries* and *destruction* of those *civil-wars* (which they do not call *rebellion*) upon *the woful miscarriages of the king himself*, which they say were *many and very great*. Was this to make his *memory glorious!* Is this a *vindication* of their *loyalty!* to throw all the *blood* of their own cursed *rebellion* upon the *king!*

XV. Of the presbyterians being instrumental in the restoration of K. *Charles* II.

No less *shameful* are the *boasts* they now make of their *loyalty* to K. *Charles* II. which is repeated in this *Occasional Letter*, and applied to the *whigs* in general, p. 29. *who* (as is there said) *were instrumental in restoring* K. Charles II. *and who have always detested the barbarous murder of his royal father.*

Now if this were true, it can be said only of the *presbyterian whigs*, when they were *kicked* out by the *independent whigs*. So then the *prevailing party* were *whigs* still.

But now as to the *presbyterians* carriage in this affair, they being under *hatches*, could find no way to *retrieve* themselves, but to try if they could make a *presbyterian*, and a *property* of the young *king*; and thereby gain the advantage of the *royal* name on their side against their *enemies*, the independents. And the *presbyterian* party

still prevailing in *Scotland*, thence sent *commissioners* to treat with the *king* then at *Breda*. And he having agreed (thro' the necessity of his affairs) to all the insolent *articles* sent to him by the *parliament* and the *general assembly*, he came into *Scotland* in the year 1650, about two months after they had, in a most *infamous* manner, *hanged* the glorious *marquess* of *Montrose*, his majesty's *commissioner* and *general*, as an earnest what he himself was to expect!

But now behold their *truth* and *sincerity*! As soon as they had got the *king* into their hands, they considered him as their *prisoner*, and a *victim* to the *good old cause*. The *commission* of the *general assembly* published a paper I have now before me, and was afterwards *printed* in the year 1653, entituled, *Causes of the Lord's Wrath against* Scotland, *&c.* where, p. 52, 53. they assigned this as one of the causes, *The authorizing of commissioners to close a treaty with the king, for the investing him with the government, upon his subscribing such demands as were sent to him.* And coming to answer the objection that he had done all that was demanded of him by *the parliament of this kingdom, and the commission of the general assembly; to which we reply* (say they *p.* 55.) *That those demands were deficient.* And that *a paper and verbal security* was not sufficient. And that *to settle with him upon such paper securities, and accordingly to intrust him, was but to mock God, and to deceive the world, and to betray and destroy our selves.* For they pretended to know his heart, and give this as one reason why it was not sound, p. 57. That when *he did condescend to subscribe the demands, and take the covenant, it was with a reserve of a declaration to be printed therewith, which he did not pass from, until the commissioners of the church did refuse to admit thereof.* If we had this *declaration*, it might in some measure alleviate the *king*'s sin in taking that cursed *covenant*. But he was *young*, and willing to be at *home*. In the same *page* they fall upon the *parliament* in *Scotland* for their over-forward *loyalty*, as one of the *causes* of *God's wrath, that the news of the late king's death being brought to* Edinburgh *on the Lord's day at night, the parliament*

did

did the next day, before twelve of the clock, proclaim this king with all publick solemnity, without setting any time apart to seek the Lord for counsel and direction therein.

Yet they say, *p.* 58. *Albeit they durst not altogether deny duty to be in making application to the king; yet did the sense of the Lord's controversy with him and his house, together with his walking in his former way, lie heavy on their spirits, and made them rather fear a curse, than expect a blessing thereupon.*

The meaning of their seeking the Lord.

How! fear a *curse* for performing what they confess to be their *duty!* Is there not more cause to fear a *curse* for not doing our *duty?* But these men, as the *quakers*, think nothing that is commanded in holy *scripture* to be their *duty*, unless it be commanded by their own *spirit anew*. The *quakers* learned this *doctrine* from them. And indeed, all *enthusiasm*, when pursued to the fountain, is the same. They *pray* not for *grace* to resist *temptations* against their *duty*, but, like *Balaam*, in things which *God* has already commanded, they ask new *counsel* and *advice*, whether it be his *will* or not? And when they find a strong *inclination* for what they have a *mind* to, this is the *answer* of *God* to them! and they proceed accordingly. And this they call *seeking* of the *Lord!* Thus *Oliver* pretended to *seek* the *Lord*, and went to *prayer*, when the *king* was carried to the *scaffold*, and said the *Lord* had answered, that he must *die*. Some of the *regicides* pleaded the same at their *trials*, that they *sought* the *Lord* for what they did.

Some have *sought* the *Lord* to know whether *fornication* was a *sin?* and being answered by *impulses*, have been persuaded, even to *argue* and *write* in defence of it, and make *proselytes* to it; and too many have they made. Thus of *robbery*, *lying*, and *cheating*; and thus of *schism*, of *sacrilege*, and of *rebellion*. Who ever heard among all the *long-winded prayers* of the *dissenters*, one *petition* to save them from the *sin* of *rebellion*, or of *sacrilege?* No, they know no such *sins!* In their *Assembly's Annotations* upon the whole *Bible*, printed 1646,

they could find no such *sins* in all the *holy writ!* no *sacrilege* in the sin of *Achan*, of *Belshazzar*, of *Ananias* and *Saphira*. And indeed there is no such *sin*, if seizing upon the *revenues* of the *church*, nay upon the *churches* themselves, and things *consecrated* to *holy* uses, be not it! We cannot *rob God* in *person*; but in the *persons* of his *priests*, and in things *dedicated* to his *service*. And we *rebel* against *God*, when we *rebel* against his *vice-gerents*, those lawful *kings* and *governors* whom he has set over us.

But if he will *dispense* with us, in these *small* matters, we will be *as good to him another way!* we will *preach* against *sabbath-breaking*, even to *Judaizing!* we will abhor *idols*, if he will let us commit *sacrilege!* we will make as *long prayers* as the *Heathen*, if we may *devour widows houses*, set the whole *nation* in a *flame*, and take the *plunder* to our selves! We will *rebel*, and perjure our selves for the *glory* of the *Lord!* And we will *seek* to *him* in every thing, and not give over our *importunity*, till we find his *answer* in our hearts!

But to go on with our story, *Oliver* was then in *Scotland*, at the head of an *army* against them and their *king*, and expostulating with them for their back-sliding from the principles of the *good old cause*, in setting up a *king:* they, to obviate this, and satisfy, or *gull* their brethren the *independents*, framed a *declaration* for the *king* to sign, wherein he should lay the *blood* and *guilt* of the whole *rebellion* upon his *father* and *himself*, and justify the *loyalty* and godly *intentions* of the *saints* who had *fought* against them; and promised to root out *episcopacy* in *England*, as well as in *Scotland*. To discard all *malignants*, &c. I have *annexed* that *declaration*, *Appen.* N. I. because it is not preserved in any of our *histories* that I know of.

The *king* refused to *sign* this, as he had very good reason. Whereupon the *commission* of the *general assembly* met at the *West Kirk* at *Edinburgh*, and drew up the *declaration* hereunto likewise *annexed*, commonly called *The Act of the West Kirk*, wherein they *renounce* the *king*

and his *cause*, upon any other *terms*. And they obliged the *committee* of *estates*, then sitting, to *ratify* the same; and ordered the *general* of their *army* to send this *declaration* to *Oliver*, as the ground of their *quarrel*, supposing the *king* should comply with it; which *letter* is likewise *annexed*.

The *king* finding himself thus *deserted* and *betrayed*, and nothing else to save him from immediate *ruin*, and being delivered up, as his *father*, into the hands of his implacable *enemies*, did at last prevail with himself to sign the *declaration*. Which yet did not satisfy the *presbyterians*; for in the aforesaid *remonstrance* of their *general assembly*, p. 57. they lay this upon him, *That he did for a long time refuse to subscribe the declaration which was tendered to him, for the acknowledging of his own, and his parent's guiltiness for the time past, and according to his duty for the time to come; and after that he had, with a great deal of reluctancy, subscribed to the same, he did oftentimes express, that he did not think his father guilty of blood, and that notwithstanding he had so declared, he had his own meaning thereof.*

And as the *manner* of his *signing* this *declaration* did not please the *presbyterians*, for that was impossible! as little did it satisfy the *independents*, when it was *signed*, or reconcile them to the *presbyterians*, for the contest then was betwixt these two *parties* for the *power*; and they *banged* the *presbyterians* heartily at *Dunbar*, whose *word* that day was *the Covenant*, the best *victory* ever the *king* lost!

But the *presbyterians*, after this *defeat*, sought to *revenge* themselves upon the *king*, and pressed upon him other *acts* more *shameful* and *outragious*; which the *king* resolutely *refusing*, seeing no end of their *encroachments*, was threatened with no less than the laying hands upon his *person*, which forced him to fly for the saving of his *life*, to his *northern friends* and *forces* under general *Middleton*; where he treated with the *presbyterians* at a distance, and had *hostages* given on both sides for performance of *articles*; one of which was, that he should be forthwith *crowned*, as was stipulated with him at *Breda*;

but

but nothing less intended by the *presbyterians* all this time, till they had sufficiently peeled all *royalty* from him. But it was now performed in a very *uncouth* manner, *January* the *first*, 165$\frac{2}{1}$. Mr. *Robert Douglas* from the *general assembly*, preaching the *coronation sermon* full of *treason* before him (which is in *print*) telling him what sort of a *covenanted king* they had made him. And the old *marquess* of *Argyle* supplied the place of the *archbishop*, in setting the *crown* upon his *head*, and giving him his *benediction*.

The *August* following, 1651, the *king* marched into *England*; and the *independents* kept a watchful eye upon the *presbyterians* in *London*, then hoping to get into the *saddle* again. And that same *month*, one Mr. *Love*, a *presbyterian minister*, was *executed*, for correspondence with the *king* and the *presbyterians*. His *trial* was *printed*, which I have read, with the manner of his *execution*, and his *speech* upon the *scaffold*, which was exceeding *long*, and full of *cant*. In it he took special care to free himself and the *presbyterians* from the least tergiversation from the *good old cause*, or the *scandal* of being thought to *repent* of their *rebellion* and *actings* against K. *Charles* I. which he *vindicated* to the last. This is their *royal martyr*, of whom they have made such *boasts!* and of whom the *Dissenters Answer to the High-Church Challenge*, lately printed, 1704, says, *p*. 43. *I assure you the author of this wears a mourning ring on his finger, given at the funeral of Mr*. Christopher Love, *a presbyterian minister, beheaded* An. 1653. (it should be 1651.) *for the horrid phanatick plot, contrived for the bringing in, as they then called him*, Charles Stuart, *and the restoring of monarchy*: But how comes this to be a vindication of the *dissenters* and *phanaticks?* Were they not such who put Mr. *Love* to death? But if it clear not the *dissenters* in general, yet it does the *presbyterians*—as we have seen—to make use of the name of a *king* for their own ends, divesting him, at the same time, of the *power* of a *king!* and justifying all their *treasons* against his *martyred father!* and laying all the *blood* and *misery* which attended their unnatural *rebellion* upon his *head*, as *the Dissenting Ministers Vindica-*

tion before-mentioned likewise does. There is a reason why our *dissenters* keep the *fifth* of *November*, for that was a *popish plot*; but not the 30th of *January* (except in their *calves-head solemnities*) for that plainly lies among the *dissenters*, let them shove it from one to another as they please! and if they had that *horror* and *detestation* for that execrable *murder*, as they *sometimes* pretend, to serve a *turn*, they would not *revile* and *ridicule* it, as they do, calling it a *madding-day*, and such like *tokens* of their *respect*; which they shew us every day in *print*. And we know how their *party* struggled hard in the *house* of *commons*, since the *revolution*, to have the *observation* of this *day* laid aside. And why so, if they thought it no *reproach* to them? if they were *perfectly innocent* of it?

But to give the *whigs* and *dissenters* all the advantage they would have, suppose that *part* of them, called *presbyterians*, had been really against the *murder* of K. *Charles* I. and for the setting up of his *son* K. *Charles* II. as this had been no justification of the *rest*; so neither would it be any *proof* of the *loyalty* or *monarchical principles*, even of these *presbyterians*; for men's *actions* are no certain proof of their *principles* (except of those who voluntary *suffer* for them) where there is an apparent *temptation* for them in the way of *advantages* to be made by it, as these *presbyterians* had, in the setting up K. *Char.* II. thereby to regain that *power* which the *independents* had taken from them, and used *rigorously* over them. But they shewed their aversion to *monarchy*, though thus forced to make use of it, by those unworthy *limitations* before-mentioned which they put upon it, in the person of this *king*.

Men's *principles* are only known when they act *freely*, without *compulsion* or *temptation*. In times of *persecution* men have *renounced* that *faith*, which notwithstanding they did firmly *believe*, and others have been *bribed* to act quite opposite to their own *sentiments*. But where no such *biass* is in the way, men are to be *distinguished* by their known and avowed *principles*.

Now

Now let the *whigs* or *dissenters*, or any of them, shew any one *principle* of *loyalty* that they have, or any notion of *government* that is consistent with *monarchy*, or indeed with any settled *frame* or *constitution*; or any *principle* of *treason*, of perpetual *rebellion* and *revolution*, which they have not; and they will shew the world a *discovery!* When they had the *power* in their own hands, they *supplanted* and *kicked* out one another, without intermission, and all upon the same foot of *power* in the *people*, till their own *confusions* brought in *order* and *restoration* of the antient *government* and *monarchy*.

And so much for their *loyalty* at this time.

XIV. Of occasional conformity

I come now to a new *notion* and *reason* for *occasional conformity*, that I have met with no where else but in this *Occasional Letter*, which coming to answer the *objection* of those who receive the *sacrament occasionally* in the *church*, and afterwards *rail* at her, does justify it, with this reason, *p.* 25. *For as I take it, the receiving the sacrament, is not engaging to be true to the church a man receives it in.* This is a very *extraordinary* reason! for the *holy sacrament* is the very *tessera* and *bond* of *Christian unity* and *love*, which is exemplified in the *unity* of the several *corns* in one *loaf*, as the *apostle* speaks, *We being many, are one bread, and one body*, 1 Cor. x. 17. Now sure the *members* of the same *body*, ought, at least, to be *true* to one another, and to the *body*.

But to lessen the *horror* of this *position*, which seems a *dissolution* of all *Christian faith* and *charity*, I must not conceal a *salvo* he brings in for it, which yet is no *salvo* at all, but brought in merely to *amuse!* for when he says, *That the receiving the sacrament is not engaging to be true to the church a man receives it in*, he adds, *so much as to be faithful to his God.*

Now, what is the meaning of all this? Is it not *God* who requires us to keep that *bond* of *unity* and *love*, of which the holy *sacrament* is a *symbol?* And is it not being *unfaithful* to *God*, not to be *true* to this?

May not the ſame be ſaid in any *church*, or *communion*, where a man receives the *ſacrament?* And ſo, it is not any *bond* of *unity*, or ſo much as *truth* in any *church!* What then? it may be made uſe of in *diſſimulation* and *hypocriſy*, to *undermine* and *deſtroy* that *church*, under the moſt *ſacred ſymbols* of *truth* and *love*, even the very *body* of *Chriſt!* It is *frightful* to *repeat* this! When the *holy kiſs* went along with this *ſacrament*, would it not be a *Judas-kiſs*, which ſuch an *occaſional conformiſt* ſhould give to his *fellow-communicants*, with whom he thought not himſelf *united*, and ſought their *undoing*, and the *ruin* of that *church*, with whom he did *communicate!*

By this ſort of *ſalvo* a man may *ſecurely* vent all the *treaſon* and *wickedneſs* in the world! For example, I owe not *obedience* or *truth* to my *prince*,——*ſo much as to God!* to be *faithful* or *juſt* to *man*,——*ſo much as to God!* and ſo, not to be *true* to the *church*, though I receive the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt* with her; and, in that ſenſe, do *pawn* them to her, for my *truth* and *fidelity* to her, and my *unity* with her! and all is *ſolved*, by ſaying, *Not ſo much as to be faithful to my God!*

Whither will men *wander*, when they ſeek to *defend* what themſelves know to be *wicked!* when they give themſelves up to the *drudgery* of *writing* for a *party*, which they muſt ſupport *right* or *wrong!* when they have no *principles* left, but to ſerve preſent *turns!*

XVII. No treaſon againſt an hereditary king.

What elſe is it could make this *author* inſinuate, as if no *treaſon* could be committed againſt K. *Char.* II. or ought not to have been *puniſhed?* for *p.* 27. he calls thoſe *very innocent men*, who ſuffered for the *Rye-Houſe-conſpiracy*, and *confeſſed* it at their *deaths*, and ſlanders *ſome parliaments ſince*, as if they had ſaid the ſame. His reaſon muſt be, becauſe their *attainders* were *reverſed*, as of *Walcot*, &c. in the beginning of this *revolution*. Though the ſame *Walcot*, as others, did *confeſs* themſelves *guilty* of the deſigned *aſſaſſination* of the *king* and *duke*, and utter ſubverſion of the *government*, both in *church* and *ſtate*, even when they were at the *gallows*.

The

The *attainders* likewise of *Argyle*, and others, who openly invaded *Scotland* in the *reign* of K. *James* II. were taken off in that *country*. But may not a *guilty* man be *pardoned*, or his *attainder* reversed after his *death*, for the benefit of his *heirs?* Does not this rather suppose him to have been *guilty?* else what need of a *pardon?* But did any of these *parliaments* declare them to have been *very innocent men*, as this *author* infers? the consequence of which would have been, that no *treason* could have been committed against K. *Char.* or K. *Jam.* but only against K. *Will.* Did not K. *Char.* II. *pardon* some of the very *regicides?* Did he therefore think them *very innocent men*, who *murdered* his *father?* But these men think, that it is no *treason* to *depose* or *murder* an *hereditary king*, as not being the *people*'s king! This is our *author*'s doctrine, if I can make *sense* of it. But he has full liberty to explain himself, which we expect in his *next*.

He goes on, and accuses K. *Char.* II. of *tyranny*, for the few that were *executed* in the *Rye-House-plot*, and proposes it as a *frightful* example to after ages. For quoting out of the *New Assoc.* how easily that *faction* was subdued by K. *Char.* II. after the *Rye-House-plot*, and the *Oxford parliament*, only by *shewing his authority, and letting them see he was not afraid of them* (though they boasted as much of their *numbers* and *power* in the *country* as they do now) this *author* answers, p. 26. *But if he would have spoke out, the same measures must be, preparing axes and gallows; for that was the method which was then taken.* These *axes* and *gallows* run strangely in this *man*'s mind! Has he any *qualms?* he will have the *dissenters* hanged whether we will or no! But they were not all *hanged* then that did *deserve it*. If more had been, some had been saved from the guilt of *rebellion* a *second* time! But as it was not that *king*'s design, nor, I dare say, any body's now, to have all this *set* of people *destroyed*, only *disarmed* from doing farther *mischief*, by having no *power* put into their hands; so where any thing is touched upon that *point*, they have no *defence*

to make, but that *senseless* and *invidious clamour*, to say that the *design* is to have them all *extirpated!* as if there was no medium betwixt that and putting the *sword* into their hands! that they might *extirpate* us!

XVIII. Their notion of rebellion.

But to shew you some more of his *no-principles*, he falls upon the *author* of *New Assoc.* for an expression (which I cannot find in the place he quotes, which is *p.* 24.) wherein he happened to say, *The rebellion of the Sevenois*, and hews him down for calling those people *rebels*. Now, Sir, perhaps that *author* was one of the *jure-divino-men*, who think it *not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms*, &c. as our *laws* once spoke. And in that case, Sir, you should have afforded him some *reason* to open his *understanding*, besides calling these *a poor distressed people*. Perhaps he thinks so as well as you; and the more, for what he calls their *rebellion*, which has rendered them much more *miserable* than they were before, he will say, that he pities all people in *distress*, and is an enemy to *persecution*. But he may be apt to ask, whether the *protestants* in *Hungary* were not *persecuted*, and terms broken with them, and had as much *right* to take *arms* for their own *preservation*, as the *Sevenois?* And how then came these to be *rebels*, more than the *Sevenois?* Does their *success* alter the *justice* of the *cause?* Or their being a *disturbance* to the *emperor*, who is one of our *allies?* If so, we go not upon *principles*, but upon what makes *for* us, or *against* us! And sir, this makes us very *contemptible* to those *people* who pretend to *principles*, and gives them opportunity to think that we have none: therefore in your next please to clear this matter a little more, and for the future beware of giving such *handles* against the *cause* you would maintain; that you be not thought a *true Tom-Double*, either set down your *principles* and *stand by them*, or else *renounce* them; but do not *betray* them.

And

And if you would not despise a little *help*, I offer this *method* to your consideration, to get over all this matter more easily. Let then the *Sevenois* be *rebels*, equal to the *Hungarians*, or not, upon the point of *principle*; yet the case of *war* alters the thing as to us. Who knows not that *war* makes many things *lawful*, which otherwise are not so? even to stir up *rebellion* and *sedition* in our enemies country, as they would serve us, if they could. Though I know, that men of strict *principle* do *object* against this *method*; but we have the *practice* of the *world* on our side! therefore we will beat down the *protestants* in *Hungary*, and call them *rebels*, because they are against our *ally*; and we will support the *Sevenois*, and they shall not be *rebels*, because we are at *war* with *France*. The one are *rebels*, and the other are not, as to *us*, however it be as to *themselves!* let them look to that!

XIX. The *Sevenois* cleare. from rebellion

And whocan deny, but that *war* will justify this *method* with *subjects*, when it does it as to *kings* themselves! Who would not pull down a *king* he is at *war* with, and *own*, or *disown* his title, as serves best for our *turn?* We did own *Philip* of *Spain* before the *war*; what then? And though he was set up upon the foot of the *people*, and *recognized* by the *corteze*, or *parliament*, by the *grandees*, and *visibly*, to all *appearance*, by the *generality* of the *people*, and is now king *de facto*, and, as far as the *people* can give him a right, *de jure* too; what of all this? By the unquestionable *prerogative* of *war*, have we not reduced him to plain *duke* of *Anjou* again, and set up the *de jure* of *Char*. III. by *inheritance*, against the *de facto* of *Philip* by the *people?* And though this was not done at the beginning of the *war*, nor was the *cause* of the *war*; and that even since the *war* was *proclaimed*, our *Gazettes* did own *Philip* as *king* of *Spain*; all that makes nothing to the matter, for in *war* we must take our own *time*, we are not to be directed by our *enemies!*

Sir, I leave it to you, whether this does not *solve* all these *objections* cleverly, and by the *principles* of *war!* so that you need not be afraid to go on with these men upon *principles*. You must always set up one *principle* against another. And *war* makes every thing *lawful*, it makes *robbery* to be *plunder*, and *killing* no *murder*, and why not *king* and *no king!* Remember that your *scene* is in *war*, and you are safe in your *entrenchments!*

XX. This author an enemy to peace.

But I would not advise you to make such desperate *sallies* as you do, and where you are sure to be beaten back. You throw your *flail* about so *heedlessly*, that you may beat out your own *brains* with it. What need had you, in the very next *paragraph*, to that above quoted, p. 28. to make so *severe* a *reflection* upon the *author* of the *New Assoc.* for his *praying*, with *David*, to *Scatter the people that delight in war, and would entail it upon us and our posterities?*

Is it not a good *prayer?* And must not every good *Christian*, and true *Englishman* say *amen* to it? But you are very *angry* with it, and say *ironically* of it, *A kind reflection indeed! an agent for* France *could have said little more.* Pray, Sir, how is *France* concerned? Is praying against *people* that *delight* in *war*, speaking in favour of *France?* Is it not *France* that would entail *war* upon us? And is speaking against such, being an *agent* for *France?* You will give us a new notion of *France!* Is not the *French king* apparently the cause of the *war?* Is not he the *aggressor?* And must not the *blood* shed then lie upon him? *A kind reflection indeed!* But it seems this *author* is an *agent* for *some* he knows, who *delight* in *war*, and would *entail* it—against whom we *pray* every day in our *churches*, that *God* would *abate* their *pride*, *assuage* their *malice*, and *confound* their *devices*.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT

TO

LEGION.

New-Vamp'd *MILLION*.

Gentlemen,

WHO ſubſcribe your ſelves *devils*, ſaying, *Our name is Legion, for we are many.* You have been called *Round-heads*, *Whigs*, and ſuch like *nick-names*; but we knew not your true *name*, till your *godfathers* have nowtold us! And if you had not been *poſſeſſed*, you would never have taken ſuch a *name* to your ſelves. But you think to *frighten* us with your *numbers*, and now ſubſcribe your ſelves *Million*, and *more*. You would reduce us to the *Indian religion*, to *worſhip* the *devil* for *fear*. Is this your *reformation!*

And as to your *numbers*, none can take it to be any thing elſe but an empty *brag*, while we ſee the *houſe* of *commons* is againſt you. And how better can the *ſenſe* of the *nation* be known?

And your now falling foul upon the *house* of *commons*, who are the *representatives* of the *people*, and taking sanctuary with the *lords*, who are created *arbitrarily*, at the *mere will* and *pleasure* of the *king*, is a total overthrow of your *foundation-principle* of the *power* in the *people*; whose *choice* you like not so well as whom the *king* has *chose*; yet you rail at *prerogative!*

Upon your foot the *people* should have power to turn out their *representatives*, whenever they are displeased with them, and to *choose* others, by their own *authority*, to meet *when* and *where*, and as *often* as they *please*; and to be *accountable* to the *people*.

But it was never so in *England*, or any where else; nor can it be; it would be perfect *anarchy* and *confusion*.

Therefore, you *whigs*, or *devils*, have given a demonstrative *proof* against your own *pretences* of *power* in the *people*.

And if you cannot solve these things, you can no longer be believed by any man of *common sense*. But to pursue your own allusion, your *Legion* must be turned into the *herd* of *swine*, those *beasts* of the *people*, who being once *possessed* with *you*, run *headlong* to their own *destruction*.

And now, my *little devils*, I'll tell you a *story*. The *secretary* of *Oliver Cromwell*, Mr. *Thurlo*, being asked by a *noble peer* (whom I can name) soon after the *restoration*, 1660, how it came to pass, that their *party* being possessed of the *people* and the *power*, came so unaccountably to lose *both*, as it were in a *moment?* Mr. *Thurlo* answered, that it was chiefly owing to the *cavalier-pamphlets*. And though, said he, those wrote on our side were much more *numerous*, having the *countenance* and *encouragement* of the *government*; yet, I must confess, that the other wrote for the *royal* cause, had the *wit* and the *argument* of us. They exposed what the *people* at last *felt*; the *oppression*, the *giddiness*, and *unstableness* of *government*, upon the foot of the *people*. And all our *authority* could not keep our ground against it.

The

The application, gentlemen, is easy. If you cannot learn to speak *sense*, if you will set up *principles* which you cannot *maintain*, and then *act* in direct *opposition* to them; though you have all the *connivance* (at least) of the *government* to *write* on, without *controul*; and that the *people* have been hitherto even *bewitched* (a *second* time) with your *pretences* of *liberty* and *property*; yet their *eyes* will be opened by the force of *truth* and *experience*; and you sent to the *place* from *whence* you *came*; and the *nation* rescued from the *fatality* you have brought upon them, of being a *kingdom divided against it self*; and which cannot *stand*, unless your *leaven* be purged out of it.

CAS-

CASSANDRA.

(But I hope not)

Telling what will come of it.

NUM. II.

IN

ANSWER

TO THE

Occasional Letter.

NUM I.

WHEREIN THE

New ASSOCIATIONS, &c.

Are CONSIDERED.

The THIRD EDITION.

Printed in the YEAR MDCCL.

CASSANDRA.

(Her Hope not)

Telling what will come of it.

NUM. II.

IN

ANSWER

TO THE

Occasional Letter.

NUM I

WHERIN THE

New ASSOCIATIONS, &c.

Are CONSIDERED.

The THIRD EDITION

Printed in the Year MDCCCL.

CASSANDRA.

THE *Occasional Letter* is not content to spend its *wit* and *malice* against the *author* of the *New Association*, but falls upon others, whom he supposes to be of the same *party*, and undertakes to *battle* them all!

I. Several authors reflected upon in the *Occasional Letter*.

One he does not name, nor his *book* neither; but makes what he says an act of the *party*, thus p. 21. *By one of their late books we are all, that are hearty at least for the principles of the late revolution, called schismaticks, and foreign churches appealed to, and declarations made, that there was no continuing in our communion without hazard of their salvation.*

1. One not named.

Now in the book which I am confident he means, there is not, in the first place, any argument against the *late revolution*; it meddles not with the state-point; it is wholly an *ecclesiastical* dispute, of the *rights* of the *church*, with relation to the *civil powers* in general, without entering into the contest of *competitors* about that *power*.

In the next place, as to the point of *schism*, he makes it allowable only in such cases where there is a *hazard* of our *salvation*. And is not this more *orthodox* and *rational*, and more for the *peace* and *unity* of the *church*, than such a slight notion of *schism*, as that we may run into it, for things our selves own to be *indifferent*, and with which we may comply *occasionally*, without any *hazard* at all to our *salvation*? Yet these *latter* he sets himself to *justify*, and *condemns* the *former*!

The point that *author* insists upon is *lay-deprivation*; and if I mistake not the *author* of this *Occasional Letter*, he has expressed himself elsewhere against it. I know not a *clergyman in England* that is for it in plain terms,

or

or would ever wish to see it *practised* again in *England*; whatever some may say to justify the *complying* with it, when it is done by an *irresistible force:* so that there needed not such an *exclamation* against that very *learned author*.

2. Abridgement of *Eusebius*

He next falls upon the *abridger* of *Eusebius* in the same pag. 21. and says, *That all the passages which protestants make use of against papists, and which are some of them the strongest against them of all antiquity, are omitted.* He names none of them; and the *abridger* professes that he cannot so much as *guess* at what he means; desires him to *instance*, and he will be obliged to *justify* himself.

He has put four *marginal notes* of his own to the whole *abridgment*, and *two* of them are against the *papists*, one p. 85. upon the *sufficiency* of the holy *scriptures*, the other p. 100. concerning the *canon* of the *scriptures*. That p. 90 is against the *Arians*. And for the *fourth*, p. 177. is of the patient *suffering* of the *primitive Christians* under their *persecutors*, and that they thought not *rebellion* a lawful *remedy*, which may be justly reckoned against the *papists* too, and their *deposing-doctrine*, on account of *religion*. But it seems it has hit some other sort of *folks*, who have no worse word than *popery* to bestow (except that of an *high-churchman*) and they throw it, as a *blind man* does his *club*, at all who come in their way.

3. Preface to the *Abridgment*.

The next who is attacked in the same *paragraph* is the *author* of a *Preface* or *Epistle*, before the said *Abridgment*; *wherein* (says this *Occasioual Letter*) *there are vile reflections unjustly cast upon arch-bishop* Tillotson, *and very kind encomiums upon some of the great managers in K.* James's *reign, and one of the chief champions for a popish cause.*

As to this last of *encomiums*, I can find nothing like it, not a tittle in that *Preface*. This is pure *invention*, and *slander* for *slander* sake! Let this *author* point it out and name it.

As

As to the other part of the *accusation* concerning arch-bishop *Tillotson*, he is not once named in all the *Preface*, nor any *book* of his, or any *book* at all, in the place intended; so that the *applier* of this to any body is the *author* of the *scandal*. There are indeed some very offensive *tenets* named, p. 17, 18. wherein the *truth* of the *Christian* religion is highly concerned; and that ought to take place of the regard we have to any man; and how more tenderly could it be done, as to the *author*, than neither to *name* him, nor the *books* where they are to be found? Others might say the same things. But if this *vindicator* will put it upon arch-bishop *Tillotson*, he ought then to have *justified* those *passages*, or to have shewed, that they were falsly attributed to the *arch-bishop*. I desire that neither I, nor any *friend* of mine, may have such *vindicators!* to bring a man's *name* upon the *stage*, under an *accusation*, and then not to say one word in his *defence!* I leave it to the *reader*, whether the *author* of that *Preface*, or this *Occasional Letter*, has done most injury to the *memory* of arch-bishop *Tillotson?*

II. Of charging books upon parties.

But be that as it will, why are these *books* charged upon whole *parties* of men? unless you will allow the same liberty. We must suppose that is intended.

Therefore we have liberty, by our own rule, to charge upon the whole body of the *whigs* and *dissenters*, those *pamphlets* that come out on their side; those which endeavoured to defeat the *succession* of the *queen*, and bring in the *house* of *Hanover* before her; or now upon her, to *supplant* her; which represent the *house* of *Hanover* as enemies to our *church*, and fixed to the interest of the *dissenters*; so that the way to make *court* to them, in time, is, to set up the *dissenters*, and depress the *church*. And all those *pamphlets*, which, pursuant to this *politick*, do daily throw out the most bitter *invectives* against the *church* of *England*, under the name of the *high-church*, and cry up *moderation*, that is, as they explain it, to let in the *dissenters* to all places of *power* and *trust*; I say, that by the *rule* here set down, and *practised* by

by this *author*, all these are to be charged upon the *party*, upon the *whigs* and *dissenters*.

Observator. And they stand particularly answerable for their *Observator*, who expressly maintains the *deposing-doctrine*, makes the *king* but one of the *three estates*, accountable to the other *two*, or one of them which represents the *people*; and even *deposable* by them, to be *attainted*, and put to *death* by them; or, to give it in his own *modest* words, (*Vol.* II. *Num.* 22.) *To be deprived of all power, imprisoned, deposed, and confined to monasteries, drawn through the streets, cut to pieces*, &c. *and all this for their treason against the state.* He instances in *Nero*, who, he says, *was attainted of treason, and condemned to die.* This was bringing the matter as near as he could to our *royal martyr*, whom these *infernal fiends* called a *Nero*, as their *predecessors* did his *master* a *Beelzebub*. And to cut off the *distinction*, that the *emperors* of *Rome* were then *elective*, but our *kings* are *hereditary*, he asserts in a following *Observator* (*Vol.* II. *Num.* 25.) *That the regal dignity can never be hereditary*; his reason is, because it is an *office*, and compares it to that of the *lord mayor* or *sheriffs*. It is an *affront* to *argue* with such a *brute*. This is only to shew the *maxims* of the *party*. He endeavours to prove that our *government* was never *hereditary*, because the *line* of *succession* was often *broke*, and *usurpations* made upon it. But if he had *common sense*, he would have seen, that this is a *proof* it was *hereditary*, else the *hereditary line* could not have been *broke*. In the *contests* of *York* and *Lancaster*, both *parties* did pretend to be *next* in *blood* to the *crown*. That was the whole *dispute*; which shews that the *hereditary* right was the *rule*. He quotes a *statute* of Q. *Eliz.* (*Vol.* II. *Num.* 23.) That the *queen, with and by the parliament*, may *limit* the *succession* of the *crown*; and imposing *penalties* on those who shall deny that this may be done by *parliament, with the royal assent*. And the inferences he draws from it are, that the *parliament* may do it, without the *king* (or *queen*) or *against* them, and without the *royal assent*; and that it

it is a *right* in the *people* to do it, which is so far from being *asserted* or *implied* in the said *statute*, that the direct *contrary* is the *import* of it. He quotes (*ibid. Num.* 27.) some *acts* of *parliament* in *Scotland*, made in the *reign* of K. *Char.* II. which assert the *hereditary* right from the *laws* of *God*, as well as *man*; and that no *difference in religion, nor no law, nor act of parliament, made, or to be made, can alter or divest the right of succession, and lineal descent of the crown, to the nearest and lawful heirs.* And how does he answer this? He calls it an *act* of the *episcopal dissenters in Scotland.* Was the *episcopal* church *dissenters* then? And may they not call other *acts* made since, *presbyterian* and *whig-acts?* And so there is an end of all *acts of parliaments*, if they may be thus thrown off by any *party* that is not pleased with them! Then the known *laws* of the *land* are no *standard* of *right* or *wrong*, of *just* or *unjust*; nor are we to be *determined* by them! This is the *doctrine* of these men, who stand so much for the *laws!* who cry out, the *laws!* the *laws!* and yet will be *concluded* by no *laws* which *cross* their *humor!*

But what will they say to the many *acts* of *parliament* in *England*, particularly 1 *Eliz.* c. 3. and 1 *Jac.* c. 1. which acknowledge the *crown* of *England* to be *hereditary*, and that *jure divino* too? Why? they were *episcopal* acts likewise! and of *episcopal dissenters* too, who *dissented* from the *honest dissenters!* and the *former* were *popish* acts! what have we to do with them?

But how will they answer their own, even the *presbyterian confession of faith?* which says, *chap.* 23. That *difference in religion*, nay, that *infidelity* it self, *doth not make void the magistrate's just and lawful authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.* Could they *sham* at this rate, and even in their *confession* of *faith*, to blind the eyes of the world, that they might carry on their wicked *designs!* otherwise let *Observator* try his hand, if he can salve this from being rank *passive-obedience* and *jure divino!*

How

However he will not be out of countenance! In the same *Observator*, last named, he puts a *case* will frighten the *presbyterian-loyalty*, and *ours* too. He says, *Was there ever yet a Christian people, who suffered a prince to wade to the throne through the blood of his father? This would indeed be an unnatural succession.* It would *indeed!* and yet I fancy it not *impossible*, that the *whigs* and *dissenters* might be brought to *allow*, even of *this*, upon a *valuable consideration!* to promote the *good old cause!* to turn *hereditary* into *elective*, and mumble *kings* and *bishops!*

In the same *Observator*, to shew his skill in the *laws*, he says. *Treason is twofold, either as committed, against the king, as he is invested with the executive power, or against the people, as they are invested with the legislative power.* Here the *superior* power is put in the *people*, and the *supreme*, which is the *legislative*. The *executive* is no other than that of an *executioner*, who *executes* the *sentence* passed by his *superiors*; and he is accountable to them for his *performance*. Thus says the *Observator* in the same place, *The king of England is the people's king; and the laws of England are the people's laws*; that is, both *made* by the *people*. Thence he infers, as before quoted, that *Nero* was *attainted* of *treason*, that *kings* may be *deposed, drawn through the streets, cut to pieces*, &c. for their *treason* against the *people!*

But he will find no such *nonsense* in our *laws*, which know of no *treason* but against the *king*. And as has been before quoted in the first *Part*, Sect 2. debar the *people*, either *collectively* or *representatively*, from having any thing to do with the *legislative*, without the *king*; and it is made *premunire* to assert it, 13 *Car.* II. c. 1. Let the *Observator* think of this!

But his *fury* blinds him, he knows not what makes *for* or *against* what he would be at. He quotes (*ibid.* p. 24.) *The incomparable and truly honourable* Algernoon Sidney *his answer to* Filmer, saying thus, *He is no king who assumes the title to himself, or is set up by a corrupt party.* Now this is most *incomparable nonsense*,

upon his *scheme* of *government* in the *people*; unless he can shew, that ever any *party* of the *people*, especially the *prevailing* party, who could set up a *king*, did call themselves a *corrupt party!* or, that they were not called so, by the *opposite* contending *party!* And who is *judge* betwixt these several *parties* of the *people?* Is there any other, but *civil war* and *destruction*, till the one can *conquer* the other, and *keep* them down? The least *drachm* of *thought* would shew such a *scheme* to be *contradiction* and endless *confusion!*

But who then does **Algernoon Sidney** allow to be *king?* None, *but he, who, according to the usages required in the case, is made king. If these be wanting* (says he, as here quoted by the *Observator*) *he is neither* de facto, *nor* de jure rex; *but* tyrannus sine titulo. Did Mr. *Observator* consider where this would light!

But he grows *bold* to purpose! and having plainly said in many of his *Observators*, that the *queen* had no *title* to the *crown*, but the *act* of *settlement*, he affirms, (*ibid. Num.* 86.) That *to assert an hereditary government in* England *is a squint-eyed reflection on her majesty's title.* How now! is the *Observator* turned *Perkinite?* Will he run *counter* to the many *loyal addresses* made to her *majesty*, upon her *accession*; where they acknowledged her *undoubted right*, as well by *blood* as by *law?*

Nor will it serve his turn, to say, that he meant this only against the *Perkinites*, for that would be no *reflection* on her *majesty's title*, what a *few inconsiderable men* may say! But he *explains* it, and *applies* to it the *title* it self, in the *words* just going before, where he expressly *battles* this *position*, that *our government is an hereditary monarchy*; and says to him that asserted it, *He can never prove our government to be an hereditary monarchy, either by our laws, the custom of our* ancestors, *or our own*; *the act of settlement, I am sure, says no such thing, but the contrary*; *and for this man to assert an hereditary government in* England, *is a squint-eyed reflection on her majesty's title.* This is arguing from the *thing*, and not from what any body *says* of it. And is not a *squint-eyed* but a *manifest reflection*

tion upon her *majesty's hereditary right*, and the general *sense* and *joy* of the *nation*, expressed in their dutiful *addresses*, wherein they do *recognize* the same. But these gentlemen think, that the addition of an *hereditary* right does *hurt* her *title*, according to their *maxim*, and the *name* of one of their treasonable *pamphlets*, *The worse title, the better king*.

But as the *hereditary* right is acknowledged to be *jure divino*, in the *acts* of *recognition* of Q. *Eliz.* and of K. *Jam.* I. and by the tenor of our *laws:* so her *majesty's title* stands *firmer* upon that foundation than by the *revolution acts*; wherefore some who stood out all the *revolution acts*, and would not *recognize* K. *Will.* while the *princess* of *Denmark* lived, have submitted to her, since she came to the *crown*. Some do it on the foot of the *revolution*, others upon her *hereditary* right. If *both* then centre in her, it cannot be meant for her service to deprive her of *either*. But these men would have her stand only upon the *revolution-foot*, that they may more easily *trip* up her *heels*.

They *hate* the name of *hereditary* right, especially which is derived from K. *Charles* the *martyr*, or his *son* K. *James*. It makes the *Observator* remember the *whipping* was *forgiven* him, and the *hanging* too, which he deserved, for being engaged in *Monmouth's rebellion*; which he will let go to be such, only because it did not *succeed!* And he has payed his thankful *return* for the *mercy* then shewed him, according to the old proverb, *Save a rogue from the gallows*———

Towards which he has shewed his *loving inclination*, not *obscurely* in his *Observator* (*ibid.* N. 13.) where he does *summons* his *party* to arms, and says, *I am resolved to get my self and family compleatly armed*; *I have got already two good protestant muskets, and three basket hilt swords, that were used at* Marston-Moor, Edge-hill, *&c.* These were the *fatal* battles *successful* to the *rebels* against K. *Charles* I. which are here remembered with *pleasure!* and *notice* given to be *ready* for the like again! to set up *pus* (as they call their *commonwealth*) in her *majesty!*

 which

which they have begun in *Scotland*, by the appearance of *seven hundred* men in arms (for a *beginning*) giving out *declarations*, renouncing Q. *Anne*, *&c.* as before is mentioned. And we have allowance to take notice of the behaviour of the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*; since this author has bestowed so many of his *Observators* upon the *episcopal church* there. All which, or any thing else that comes from such an *infamous* hand, were not worth any body's regard, if he were not set up as the *cryer* and *trumpet* of the *party*.

And therefore I may bring him in as evidence against this *Occasional Letter*, which abuses the *whigs*, in saying that they *disown* their *calves-head-feasts*, as if they were *ashamed* of them! and counted those *profligate* fellows who frequent themselves. If that author be not one of them, he should let them speak for them. They will give him no *thanks* for such *vindications!*

Their *Observator* (*Vol.* II. *N.* 89.) calls their *calves-head-feasts* by no such names of *reproach*, nor *disowns* them at all; but *laughs* at those who object it, and calls them *cods-heads*.

And is far from *condemning* the *fact* which they there *commemorate*. He says of it, *I have so high a value for the prudence and justice of our fore-fathers, as not to condemn any of their actions for the common good.* He adds (with a *simile!*) *but upon good grounds, which we of this age can never have in that particular.* How so? Have we not the very *trial* verbatim? And several yet *alive* who *heard* it, and were *spectators* of the *bloody tragedy?* Have we not the horrid *indictment*, and the *sentence*, the *original* of which is still in being, with the very *cursed hands* to it who *signed* it? Have we not *Bradshaw*'s learned *speech* upon passing the *sentence*, of the *power* in the *people*, and all the *whig-principles*, which they have *transcribed* and *repeated* ever since? Did not the *Observator* know this, who has taken all his doctrines and arguments out of it, for the most part, in the same *words?* Has not he seen the *trial* of the *regicides*,

wherein they said all they could for their defence? And cannot this *cause* then be known?

But he thinks his *cause* too *glorious*, not to be owned *publickly* and *above-board!* He goes on, *We are unkind to our selves, in censuring the* justice *of our* fore-fathers actions; *and thereby do give a handle to our successors to censure ours. Did our forefathers* detruncate *the* father? *Did not we* depose *the* son, *and put one more* righteous, *in his stead? Did we not divest him of all his* regalities, *make him a* fugitive *on the earth, and may not future ages examine the difference betwixt* the decollation *and* abdication?

Are not these fine lectures to be *read* to the nation *twice* a *week!*

1. Here is a manifest *justification* of the *decollation*, as he *respectfully* calls it!

2. As plain an *arraignment* of the whole *revolution*, which he makes full as *bad* as the *decollation*.

3. A civil *lesson* to the *queen*, that she is liable to the same *usage* as *they* bestowed upon her *father*, or royal *grandfather!* and to *put one more* righteous *in her stead!* And we know whom they count *rightcous!* none that will *maintain* the *church* of *England!* Who will countenance *malignants* or *high-flyers*, either for the *church* or the *monarchy!* See the *declaration* annexed.

4. The unparallelled *insolence* with which they treat her *majesty*, in *trampling* so *disdainfully* upon the *ashes* of her royal *father* and *grandfather*. Their *story* is too *lamentable* to be *insulted* in so *scornful* a manner, and that before her *face*, as to call her *father* a *fugitive* on the earth, the very *curse* of *Cain!* And to speak with an *air* of *triumph*, of decollating and detruncating her royal *grandfather*, calling it *justice*, and the *common good!*

And then minding her *majesty* of *Edge-Hill*, *Marston-Moor*, &c. and boasting, that the same *protestant swords* and *muskets* are ready to *fight* for her——as they did for her *grandfather!*

Such *insolence* was never offered to a *crowned-head*, while upon the *throne*; which makes it justly to be feared,

feared, that they have ſomething near in *view*, which is not good! Pray God avert.

They made not near ſo much haſte with her royal *grandfather*, to whom they were *profeſſing* and *addreſſing* their *loyalty*, till they juſt had his *head* upon the *block*.

And they were not behind in their *addreſſes* to her royal *father*, calling *God* to *witneſs* their *ſincerity*! at the ſame time they were *plotting* to *deſtroy* him! and *We had done it ſooner* (ſays *Obſervator*, *Vol.* II. *N.* 84.) *if we had an opportunity of ſo doing*.

Such an impudent *herald* would never be imployed, if they were not *ready* to give the *on-ſet*.

His *character* is beſt taken from *himſelf*, who, when one aſked him what he had to ſay for all the monſtrous *villainies* charged upon him in *Fuller*'s penitential *confeſſion*, could not deny the *fact*; and made but a *jeſt* of it, ſaying, *The more miſchief, the better ſport*; and *that he loved miſchief dearly*.

From this *qualification* it was, that he had the intolerable *impudence*, in his *Obſervator* (*Vol.* II. *N.* 79.) when he was ordered to be taken into *cuſtody* by the *houſe* of *commons*, not only to *banter* and *ridicule* that *honourable houſe* (knowing what *party* he had to ſupport him) ſaying, he would *drink a glaſs of wine with their ſerjeant next May-day* (when he ſuppoſed the *parliament* would be up) but would not *keep him company this winter ſeaſon*, &c. And not only this, but he endeavoured what he could to ſet the *houſes* of *lords* and *commons* at variance, upon his *worthy* account, and threatens them withal, ſaying, *So that if the lords do not inſiſt on their privilege, as I am now their ſervant*, &c. He tells what the *nation* will ſuffer by it! and he *inſults* over the *houſe* of *commons* as his *ſervants*, ſaying, *I have now two members in the houſe of commons, repreſenting my perſon*. Theſe *commonwealth principles* make men *inſolent*, and to forget all *deference* and *regard* to their *ſuperiors*, every man looking upon himſelf as the *original* and *maker* of *kings* and *parliaments!* and *above* them! as he ſays, in the ſame *Obſervator*, *Their power is derived*

from the native right of the people, which authorizes them to make laws, to settle the succession and limitations of the crown; every king or queen of England *has her or his political essence and being from parliament*, &c. It is *astonishing* that men should be so far given up to *delusion*, as to argue against the plain matter of fact which they see before their eyes! for is it not *demonstration*, that the quite *contrary* to this *republican* notion, is the fact with us? *viz.* That the *parliament* has its *political essence* and *being* from the *king* or *queen*? Can the *king* then have his *being* from *them*? Who called that *parliament* which made the *first king*? Do the *freeholders*, who *vote* for *parliament-men* derive that *power* from the *people*, and not from the *king*'s *charters* to them? When did the *people* agree to give up their *power* into the hands of such and such *freeholders*; and excluding all others, though of *forty* times their estates and interest in the *kingdom*? who have of these *freeholders* to wear their *liveries*, and *clean* their *shoes*!

But though there is neither *sense* nor *reason* in these *schemes*, and that they are against fact too; yet, as the *Observator* says of himself, there is *mischief* in them, and that *delights* him! and too many others of his *party*. Though I am satisfied several of them are led *astray* through *weakness* of *judgment*, or not giving themselves *time* to *consider* and *examine*.

Of this *natural inclination* to *mischief* and *lying*, the *Observator* has given another notable *instance*; in that when he was in the *secret* of that *godly murderous design*, of *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, he lent all his *might* to carry on the *jest*, (as they call it, since it was *discovered*) and in his *Observators*, charged it home upon the *high-church*; to raise the *mob*, if they could, upon the whole *church*, or leave *them* to *distinguish* as they thought fit! And it was going on *apace*, before the happy *discovery*, it being put in the *mouths* of the whole *party* of *whigs* and *dissenters*, that it came from the *high-church*; not that I suppose they were *all* let into the *secret*; but they *all* did *believe* it, or they *lyed*! and the

clergy

clergy were *pointed* at, and *marked* as they walked along the *ſtreets*, and *inſulted* in private *converſation*, and called no better than *cut-throats* and *bloody-minded-men!* They were growing into the *contempt* and *hatred* of the *nation!* and all this called now a *jeſt!* They would have thought it better *ſport*, if it had *ſucceeded! godly men!* who make a *mock* of *ſin*.

But it is not only the *clergy* who are *ſtigmatized* by this *foul mouth*. In his *Obſervator* of *March* 18. *N.* 99. he throws at the whole *government*, the *bench*, the *council-table*, thoſe at St. *Stephen*'s, that is, the *houſe of commons*, but in the *houſe* of *lords* he only names the *wooll-packs*, that is the *judges* (it ſeems the *lords* continue yet in his good *graces*) and ends with *the church* in his *liſt* of *knaves*, he affords them no better word. In his *Obſervator* of *March* 11, 1703, *N.* 97. he is plainer with the *judges*, and ſays, *I am ready to anſwer in court any indictment, where I expect to have fair play, and not to be condemned without being heard, which will be the practice of our courts of juſtice as long as our preſent judges are in being. And if they are ſucceeded by the race of* Jefferies *and* Jenner, *I can but go into another country; I have been taught the way already.*

Yes, and what to do when you are there! even what you did before, to bring about another *revolution*, and ſerve the *queen*, as you did her *father!* what elſe is the meaning of rendering her whole *adminiſtration* ſo *odious*, and comparing it to what they had *repreſented* that of her *father*, her *judges*, her *council*, &c.

But he goes further in the ſame *Obſervator*, and directly *attacks* his royal *highneſs* the *prince*. He had long *ſhot* at him by a *ſide wind*, yet ſo as every body muſt ſee it, by finding fault with the management of the *fleet*, and directing whom he thought fitter to be entruſted with it. And coming now to anſwer the objection of theſe *reflections* upon the *lord high admiral*, he tells him roundly, That *affidavits were made and delivered to the prince's council, of embezzlements of the ſtores*, &c. *Notwithſtanding which, the grand grievance was not re-*

dressed, and the persons guilty were still continued to be employed in the service. And, that *the highest office in* England *is not above the law of* England, *and the laws of* England *were made to detect and punish offenders.* But the *highest office* is the *regal*; and that he means, for employing such an *admiral*; that is his constant *theme* and *doctrine*, to call the *crown* to account for *male-administrations*.

The *faction* want but the *fleet* in their hands, and then they would be *ready!* To this end they have been *blackening* all the *admirals* and *officers* in the *fleet* who are not of their kidney, as well in their *conversation*, as *proclaiming* it in their *Observators*; many of which are spent upon Sir *George Rook*, &c. They would fain *talk* them out of their *places*. When any thing miscarries in the hands of their *friends* (which happens oftener than in the others) then they lay the fault upon the *government*, and their *orders* from *above*; there is *treachery* at the *fountain!* &c.

Never was a *government* so openly and bare-faced *attacked*! This *enflaming paper* goes still abroad, and is become more *virulent*, since the *votes* of the *house* of *commons*, and the *proclamation* pursuant against the *author*. He *banters* and *ridicules* both the *queen* and *commons*, and declares he will still *write* on. He *trumpets* more *loudly* than ever; and, with the help of his *party*, thinks himself an *over-match* for the *government*. And they make use of this as an argument to shew its *weakness*, as if it could not *suppress* this *paper*.

The *grand jury* at the *Old Baily* last session, *March* 9, 17$\frac{4}{5}$. made a *presentment* against a *paper* wrote in opposition to the *Observator*, called *Heraclitus Ridens*, for reflections upon Sir *Rob. Jefferies*, lately deceased. And they did well, if they had sufficient grounds for it. I have not seen it. *Slander* and *defaming* particular *persons* is by no means to be endured, especially in *print*, where they can make no *defence*. But I wonder how they came to miss the *Observator*, who not only speaks evil of *dignities*, but bespatters private persons by *name*, *clergy-*

clergymen, and others in the *city*, even *women* who are related to them, and for that only reason endeavours to blast their *reputation*, as the *sister* of a *clergyman* in the *city*, &c. What a description does he give of Mr. *Fuller* a *justice* of the *peace*, in his *Observator* of *March* 11, *Num.* 97. whom he calls *paunch-bellied fellow*, a *kidnapper*, *a dog* in a *wheel*, a *blood-sucker*, &c. No man is safe from him, he is like a *mad-man*, throwing *firebrands*; but he is supported by a *party*, and thinks himself safe at the hand of *grand-juries* in the *city*; and is carried on by his own *natural* inclination to *mischief*, as he truly said of himself, and repeats it again, *Observator Vol.* II. *Num.* 98. *I love mischief you know.* He is *fond* of the *character*. He says, *Num.* 99. that he will *trace the scent of mischief to its proper fountain*; but that at present it *lies a little out of his depth*, and he would not *drown* himself; but bids us *have a little patience, and he may be open hearted again*; that he has been already as to the *church*, the *prince*, the *house* of *commons*, the *council*, the *judges*, &c. We may easily guess then whom he means by the *fountain* of *mischief!*

And he begins to *open* finely in his *Observ. March* 29, 1704, *Vol.* III. *Num.* 2. where he accuses all the *officers* employed in *England*, from the *highest* to the *lowest*; and promises to give such *catalogues* of their *villainy* and *knavery*, as he *prophanely* compares to what is said of our *Blessed Saviour's miracles*, Joh. xxi. 25. And this will go down among the *godly*, being intended for their *service!*

But that they might not mistake at whom he aimed, he asks what *religion* these *officers* are of whom he thus threatens? And answers, *churchmen, all churchmen, true blue protestants of the church of* England; and that *there are no dissenters among them.* Then he falls upon the *bishops*, whom he so highly *courted* while the *bill* of *occasional conformity* was depending; and O! how he praised their *moderation!* But now putting the question, where the *rogues* are to be found? he says, *Go ask the upper house of convocation; there you may hear them*

at the old trade of Billingsgate, thou rogue, and thou rogue.

The *dissenters* love-fit to the *bishops* is over, as soon as their *work* is done—till they have *need* of them again!

In the same *Observator* he gives the *character* of our *country clergy* and the *justices of peace*, and makes them both vile *sots* and *beasts*; then cries out, *There's your magistrate and parson, your spiritual guide and your temporal guide, both drunk together.* He puts Dr. *Kennet* (his name at full length) among the *Billingsgate rogues*, with the *upper house* of *conv——on.*

We see now whom they mean by the *high-church*, even all the *church* of *England*, one and the other! They have invented this name of *distinction*, on purpose to give themselves full liberty to vent all their *spleen*, unseen, as they think, against the whole *church*, under the title of the *high-church*.

And that they may leave no stone unturned, they recal the times of *forty-one*. [Though they are very angry with others who mention any thing of them, on the side of the *church* or the *king*:] and their chief *malice* is spent upon those whom their *cursed* hands have *martyred*, for their firm adherence to the *church*. They *triumph* to this day, in their *decollating* and *detruncating* K. *Char.* I. as the *Observator*, before quoted, expresses his *martyrdom*, with *exultation* and *contempt* of it!

And many *Observators* (*Vol.* III. from *N.* 18. and so on to this day *June* 10.) are spent upon that great *pillar* and *support* of our *church*, whose *blood* they likewise drunk, for that, and no other reason, the glorious archbishop *Laud*, whom they call a *papist*, and a *right reverend father* in *Satan*, to shew the *meekness* of their *temper*, and their *moderation!* And they tell you the great reason, in *Observ. Num.* 21. *That he permitted and countenanced a popish hierarchy or ecclesiastical government to be established in this kingdom.* This was one of the *articles* then exhibited against him. And we well know what they meant by a *popish hierarchy*, even the *constitution of the church of* England, which therefore they *abolished.*

lished. And it is as plain what they mean by it now; for was there any other *hierarchy* or *ecclesiastical government* in arch-bishop *Laud*'s time, than there is now? Or did he exercise an higher *authority* over his *fellow-bishops*, or over the inferior *clergy* in *convocation* than is done now? Did he ever *deprive* any *bishop* by his own *single authority?* that would have been more than even the *pope* of *Rome* ever did, and might have been called a *super-papal* exaltation! And if the *hierarchy* of our *church* was *papal* in arch-bishop *Laud*'s time, what is it now? If he was a *father* in *Satan* for supporting that *hierarchy*, what are they who support this? What will they be called by Mr. *Observator*, whenever they shall happen to lose his good *graces?* whose *commendations* now is the greatest *scandal* they lie under!

If it be not *demonstration*, that the whole *hierarchy* of the *church* of *England* is here struck at, even as now established, I shall despair of ever making any thing plain. And then we know the meaning of their calling out upon *papists* and *high-fliers*, and whom they describe by these *appellations*, even all who, as bishop *Laud*, are for supporting this *hierarchy*.

They re-print in these *Observators* the *articles* exhibited against arch-bishop *Laud*, but take no notice of the noble *defence* he made, which is publick through the nation. And there is no *book* extant, which shews more lively the cursed *spirit* of those times, in carrying on their *cause* with the blackest *lyes* and diabolical *malice*.

Here you see the effect of *answering* these men, and *proving* even to *demonstration*; they *reply* nothing! take no notice of any *answer!* but repeat their *calumnies* and *objections*, without end!

Arch-bishop *Laud* having wrote against the *church* of *Rome*, the best of any man in his age, and sealing it in his *dying* words upon the *scaffold*, and no one *article* of *popery*, or any *tendency* that way, having ever been proved against him, makes no impression upon these *saints!* It stops not their *mouths*, though it must satisfy their *consciences!* He was for the *liturgy*, for the *altar* to be *railed* in, and other *decencies* in our *worship*, which are

now universally *practised* and *established* in the *church* of *England*; therefore he must be a *papist!* And then they all are *papists* who *practise* these things, that is, all the *church* of *England*; all who are not for pulling down our *altars*, abolishing our *liturgy*, and *episcopacy* it self!

When the old *cant* of *forty-one* is taken up again, we may be sure it is for the same *ends!*

If this be not sufficient to *awaken* all that are concerned for the *church* of *England*, their *sleep* is *lethargick*, and her *ruin* is *nigh!*

As to the *author* of the *Observator*, enough has been said before, and is sufficiently known, of his *worthiness!* But there is no *book* or *paper* comes out, that is so much a *party-book*, and for which the whole *faction* is so answerable as this, it being *hugged* and *cherished* by them all, and the *author* supported, in direct *opposition* and *contempt* of the *government*, which he *ridicules*, *threatens*, and *laughs* at, the *judges*, *secretaries* of *state*, and all, for thinking to reach him by *law*, considering what a *back* he has to stand by him!

III. Of the *Secret History.*

We are now come to one, which, by what has yet appeared of it, is a *party-book* too, and a *violent* one; the *Secret History* mentioned in the *New Association*; in vindication of which this *Occasional Letter* spends several *pages*. Before I enter upon it, I must tell the reader, that the *author* of the *New Assoc.* owns he has received, since that *pamphlet* was published, an *information* in *two particulars* different from what is *said* or *implied* there. The *first* is, that his deceased friend, who *transcribed* that part of the *history* which he saw, was not put under any *restraint* or *promise* of not *transcribing* for himself, or any thing else of that sort, as that *author* was told, occasioned, as he supposes, by that *gentleman*'s refusing to give any *copy* of it, as thinking himself under an implied obligation, though none was put upon him, as that *author* is now satisfied from the person who gave it him to *copy*.

The

The other point is, that the *author* of the Secret History was so far against the *bill* for *excluding* the *duke* of *York*, that he found means of *informing* his *royal highness*, very early, of that *design* in agitation against him, and thereby came into his *good graces*. But that he drove on with the *faction* against him, at the same time, is apparent from his *history*, where he owns himself to have been for the *bill*, and that he *travelled much among noblemen in negotiation of that affair*; that my lord *Shaftsbury* was for a *total exclusion*, but my lord *Halifax* for a *limited power*. And the *author* tells how he took pains with my lord *Halifax* to bring him over to my lord *Shaftsbury*'s opinion, but *in vain*. So that these two *parties* broke upon it. Then he tells of a *project* he contrived to reconcile both *parties*, which was to have a *guardian regent* set over the *king*, in case he were a *Roman catholick*. And he tells how this *project* of his *was generally applauded by the whole party*, but *crushed* by the *king*, and would not pass the *parliament*.

Now the *author* of the *New Association* does confess, that when he wrote it, he did not know of the *author* of the *Secret History*'s being so fast a *friend* to the *duke*, as to *discover* to him the *councils* of those who were *plotting* against him. If he has *forgot*, that *author* says Sir *J. B.* can refresh his *memory*, and tell whether the *author* was rightly *informed* or not.

Now let us see what is said concerning that *history* in this *Occasional Letter*.

First, the *MS. history* is *confessed*, that there is such an one, and the *author* called an *excellent historian*, p. 14. And it is said of this his *performance*, p. 15. *That whenever his history shall see the light, the world will see as great impartialities in it, and find as many admirable and instructive passages in it, as in any book of its kind.* By this we must suppose it was not the *author* who wrote this *defence* of it; unless he *strained* upon his *modesty*, as a *blind*, that he might not be *suspected*.

However, why should so *admirable* and *instructive* a *piece* be longer *hid* from the *world?* Cannot this *age*

bear the *truths* that are in it! If the reigns of K. *Char.* II. or K. *Jam.* II. were not *commodious* for its *edition*, there has been a time *since*, when, for that reason, it would have been most *acceptable!* and that would have obviated the *objection* of its being kept up, till there shall be none alive, who can *contradict* it.

But if the *whole* must not be *published*, why are not those *passages* set down, in the *author*'s own *words*, which are pretended, in this *Occasional Letter*, to have been *falsly* quoted? because, now I think of it, that is said of never a *one* of them, only in general of *all*; and not that they are *false* neither, but as it is said, p. 12. *either false, or at best very grosly mis-represented.* And he has forgot to give any one *instance*, even of that. But he says, p. 13. ' And indeed every one of them that so much as ' bears a resemblance to the originals, happens to be ' falsly set down, and separated from what goes before ' and after, so that by the unfair recital, the thing is ' wholly mis-represented, as if one would quote the ' words of the *Psalm*, *There is no God*, without prefix- ' ing to them, *The fool hath said in his heart.*"

And what *answer* would you give to such an one? Would it not be to set down the words *omitted*, and to shew that they quite *altered* the *sense?* Could there be any other *answer?* And why then did you not give that *answer*, as to the *history?* There was a *reason*—— You say his *quotations* are *separated from what goes before and after.* So I take it to be in all *quotations*, unless you would *transcribe* a whole *book*; but does what goes before or after *alter* any thing of the *sense* of what is *quoted?* that ought to have been shewed; and we suppose *would*, if it *could*.

But that *author* had another *reason*, why he left out several things, that is, because there were several *severe*, and he believes *unjust reflections* cast upon persons of *honour* and *reputation*, of which he had no mind to be the *publisher*, nor will he do it now; but that you may not think he speaks at random, he gives one instance, with ——for the name which in the *history* is at length.

The

The *character* which the history gives of the *clergy* in general is set down in the *New Association*, p. 23. that the *author* of the history *thought ill of them all, till he saw cause to think otherwise*, as to any *particular person*. But he condescends to name a reverend and learned *divine* of the first *figure*, now living, who, he says, *Is a man that has but little knowledge in divinity, and as little sense of it*; and describes him to be a man *much* addicted *to pleasures*. And speaking of two *sermons* preached, before the *house* of *commons*, the one by *himself*, and the other by———He says, that his own *sermon* had both the *applause* and *thanks* of the *house*; but says, of——his sermon (who has the reputation of as *ingenious* a man as any in *England*) *That it was the worst sermon that ever he heard him preach*, &c.

He confesses that some of the quotations of the *Secret History* do *bear a resemblance to the originals*. Why will he not shew us this *resemblance?*

He says, that the *title* of that book is not *a Secret History*, but *in imitation of* Thuanus, *The History of his own Time*. I suppose the *author* of the *New Assoc.* did not call that *A Secret History*, as if it had been the *title* which the author gave it, but because it was kept *secret*, as if he had said a *manuscript history*. These are material objections!

As is that p. 14. where he lays such *load* upon the *memory* of the *deceased* gentleman who *transcribed* part of that *history* for *breach* of *trust*, &c. for besides what is said above of the *mistake* in that point; what *breach* of *trust* was it in that gentleman, if having *transcribed* a *part* for his own satisfaction, and kept it intirely to himself all his life, it should be found among his *papers* when he was dead? This is *fishing* for objections, and *finding* them to no *purpose!*

But because the author of the *New Assoc.* is accused of giving short *quotations*, without *fore* and *after*; I having got a sight of some part of that *Secret History*, will give a passage more at large out of it, which was brought upon this occasion. A year or two before the designed

Assassi-

Assassination of the *king*, &c. at the *Rye-House*, and the overturning of *church* and *state*, there came out as *preparatives*, a multitude of *treasonable* and *seditious pamphlets* against the *church* and the *monarchy*. The *bishops* and *clergy* then, as vigilant *watchmen*, saw the danger that *threatened*; and took care that those poisonous *books* and *pamphlets* should be *answered*; and from their *pulpits* gave warning to their *flocks* of the *wolves* then stirring among them; and endeavoured to *fix* them in the *principles* of their *duty* to the *church* and to the *crown*, that they might not be *debauched*, by these *liers in wait*, to their *destruction* both of *soul* and *body*. And minded them of what had been done by the same *set* of *men*, upon the same *principles* and *pretences*, in the former *reign*, yet fresh in their *memories*. And the *issue* shewed that there was sufficient reason for all this *caution*; for soon after followed the *Rye-House conspiracy*, prosecuted *industriously* to the *dissolution* of the *Oxford parliament*. Now the *Secret History* (for so let us call it, till it is made *publick*) takes notice of these *treasonable books*, but calls them not so, only says they were against the *church* of *England*; and takes no pains to *censure* them, or find any *fault* with their *authors*. But as to those who *opposed* them, he says (under that *head* of *the earl of Danby's trial*) in these words, ‘ Many books came out likewise ‘ against the church of *England*; this alarmed the bi- ‘ shops and clergy much; so that they set up to preach ‘ against rebellion, and the late times, in such a strain ‘ that it was visible they meant a parallel between those ‘ and the present time. And this produced at last ‘ that heat and rage into which the clergy has run so ‘ far, that it is like to end very fatally. They on their ‘ part should have shewed more temper, and more of ‘ the spirit of the gospel; whereas, for the greatest part, ‘ they are the worst-natured, the fiercest, indiscreetest, ‘ and most persecuting sort of people that are in the na- ‘ tion. There is a sort of them do so aspire to preferment, that there is nothing so mean and indecent ‘ that they will not do to compass it; and when they

‘ have

'have got into preferments, they take no care neither 'of themſelves nor of their flocks committed to their 'charge, but do generally neglect their pariſhes. If 'they are rich enough, they hire ſome pitiful curate, 'at as low a price as they can, and turn all over on 'him; or if their income will not bear out that, they 'perform the publick offices in the ſlighteſt manner 'they can, but take no care of their people in the way 'of private inſtruction or admonition; and ſo do no-'thing to juſtify the character of paſtors or watchmen, 'that feeds the ſouls of their people, or watch over 'them. And they allow themſelves in many indecent li-'berties of going to taverns and ale-houſes, and of 'railing ſcurriloufly againſt all that differ from them; 'and they cheriſh the prophaneneſs of their people, if 'they but come to church, and rail with them againſt 'the diſſenters; and are implacably ſet on the ruin of 'all that ſeparate from them, if the courſe of their 'lives were otherwiſe ever ſo good and unblameable. 'In a word, many of them are a reproach to Chriſtian-'ity and to their profeſſion; and are now perhaps one 'of the moſt corrupt bodies of men in the nation."

And thus *verbatim* out of the *hiſtory*, which I cannot let paſs, without theſe *obſervations*.

1. That *England* never ſaw before a more *learned*, *pious*, and *eminent clergy* than were at that time, of which this *hiſtory* ſpeaks.

2. That it is never to be expected but among ſo great a *body* of men, there will be ſome who live not up to their *profeſſion*. But this *accuſer* of the *brethren*, from the *many*, and the *generality*, and *for the greateſt part*, draws his concluſion againſt the whole *body*, as *the moſt corrupt body of men in the nation*.

3. This was not meant as an *admonition* to them, to *amend* them; but left as a *character* upon them for after *ages*, when they were *dead*, and could not *juſtify* themſelves.

4. He declares his *inſufficiency* to give a *character* of the *clergy*, from his own *knowledge*; becauſe he makes it one

one of his great *boasts*, that as he *hated* and *abhorred* them; so he by all means avoided their *conversation*; and gives this as one reason why he *refused* several good *livings*, which, he says, were offered to him, one particularly in the *city* of *five hundred pounds* per annum, first, because he could not in *conscience* take upon him so great a *cure* of *souls*. And if he thought *himself* not fit, surely he thought none *other!* and so none must take it: But in good *conscience* such *cures* must lie *vacant!* But he had a *second* reason, for he tells, *That the* **Temple** *in appearance being to fall vacant at that time, he was rather desirous of that, and so much the rather, that he was averse to mingle himself with the church and clergy*. He kept better company! among *statesmen* and *politicians*, and was very *busy*, as he tells himself, in their *plots* and *contrivances* against the *church* and the *crown*; where he saw better *examples* of *Christian moderation*, of *virtue* and *sincerity*, than he expected to find among the *clergy*, but would not *try!* only took their *character* from the *whigs* and *dissenters*, with whom he *plotted* their *ruin*, and therefore *avoided* their *conversation*.

But why would he take the *Temple?* Did he look upon that as a *fine cure*, with which his *tender conscience* only could dispense? Or did he think the *lawyers* had no *souls* worth taking *care* of? But he thought them fitter company for a *politician*, than the *dull-unthinking-divines*, who were rooted in their *slavish principles* of *jure divino* and *loyalty*, and had notions of *schism*, and such like *fulsome stuff!*

But if he thought it a *sin*, to take the *cure* of a *parish*, how came his *conscience* to dispense with a *greater?* But it was in a better *time!* when the *clergy* were *mended!*

However, how could so much *tenderness* of *conscience* and *charity*, as he pretends to think it no *crime* to leave so *black* and *odious* a *character* to posterity of the *church* his *mother*, had she deserved it! But when the *brightest* state of our *church*, since the *reformation*, is thus *represented*, what name shall we give it! and coming from a person

person of *figure* in it, and living in that time, what would hinder *foreign churches* to *believe* it, and our *dissenters* at *home* to make their own use of it? For what other end can any man imagine it was put upon *record* in this *history*; which, contrary to the *author*'s intention, has by a good providence appeared time enough to be *detected* and *disproved*?

But he makes amends! and the *church* of *England* shall not suffer *alone* under his *characters*; for he says further, *And indeed when I consider the general corruption of the* clergy *that has been now for many* ages *over all Christendom, I know not where to lay the first source and spring of it.* That is strange! but it is not hard to guess the *source* and *spring* whence he had it, the *virtuoso-clubs* of *deists* and *whig-politicians*, where he learned that *priests of all* religions *are the same!* and to pronounce aright the *modish* word of *priest-craft!* which is but of late invention among us, I think *Dryden* the first, in his *Absalom* and *Achitophel*. But this *historian* was the first, I believe, that ever brought it into the *pulpit*, crying out there *stentorically*, and this——*is the source and spring of all the* priest-craft *in the world*——which I *heard* from him, to my *astonishment*, in St. *James*'s *church!* And by the *theatrical* deportment, with which this *priest-craft* was acted, one would have been tempted to have thought himself at the *play-house!*

But the *source* and *spring*, which in his *history* he fixes upon as the common cause of the *corruption* of the *clergy*, is, *their too great livings*. And he wishes *they had a more precarious dependence upon their people, and that they were only to have their gratuities and benevolences, instead of a settled living. And this* (says he) *would make them more strict in their lives, and more diligent in the exercise of their ministerial function and office.* Would it not make them likewise more *impartial* and *couragious* in their *discipline*, to inflict their spiritual *censures*, and bring to open *penance*, or else *expel* out of the *church* notorious *offenders*, though their chief benefactors, on whom they must *depend* for their *bread!* Would it make them

them less *creeping* and *cringing* to the *rich* and *great* of their *flocks*, and *indulgent* to their *vices!* and less inclined to *follow* a *multitude* to do *evil!* Whether would it be a greater *ornament* and *advantage* to their *profession*, to be able to *feed* the *poor* at their *gates*, and do remarkable acts of *charity*; or to be *beggars* themselves, and *prostitute* the dignity of their *office* for a *handful* of *barley*, or a *piece* of *bread!* He may say, yes, if the *clergy* would imploy their *riches* that way, as well as the *laity* does, and were not *The most corrupt body of men in the nation!* And yet, in that most *corrupt* state of the *English church*, which he does instance, in the *reign* of K. *Char.* II. he might have found, if he had been inclined to have inquired on that side, that more acts of publick *charity* and *benefit* to the *nation* were done by the *bishops* and *clergy*, in proportion to their *revenues*, than by 500 times as much that was in the hands of the *laity*; and by one single *bishop*, at one time, more than the *saints* had done, with all the *bishops-lands* in *England*, during the many *years* they had possessed them, on pretence of making better *use* of them!

But the *notions* and *schemes* of this *historian* are taken from the *regulars* and *mendicants* of the *church* of *Rome*, to which *condition* he would have our *clergy* reduced; And yet I will appeal to himself, whether greater *scandals* have arisen, even in the *church* of *Rome*, from their *rich clergy*, or from these *begging* and *strouling friers*, who set up for *abstraction*, and *flights* of *devotion* beyond the *secular clergy*, and all other men!

I know not how to reconcile this historian's *principles* with his *practice*, but by supposing he meant, that all the *clergy* should be *poor*, except *himself!* why else would he take one of the *richest preferments* in *England?* But he thought he could make *good use* of it!

The *wisdom* of *God* foresaw the consequences of having his *priests* depend *precariously* on the *people*, for their *subsistence*; therefore he gave them his own *inheritance*, and made it *sacrilege* to *invade* it. And it was much more in proportion than belonged to any other of the *tribes*.

The

The *apostles* were indowed with the *gift* of *miracles*, which rendered them greatly *respected*.

But in the common state of things, to have the *clergy* made *poor*, is to render their *office*, as well as *themselves*, *contemptible*; and lays them open to greater *temptations*, than if they had a *settled* and *comfortable subsistence*. We may as well expect *manna*, when we have the *fruits* of the *ground*, as that *reverence* to the *poor* clergy, which was in the age of *miracles*.

Some men who have already gained, by a long tract of their *life*, a great *reputation* for *piety*, may, when reduced to *poverty*, especially if *suffering* for a *good cause*, meet with *respect* from some sort of people; but not the more, when they grow a *burden* to them, they would be willing their *neighbours* should have a *share!* They might travel like *charity*, nothing worse *entertained*, or better *recommended!*

But what is all this to the generality? What shall the *poor* young clergy do, till they have gained such a *stock* of *reputation?* that must take up a great *part* of their *life*. And may they not be *tempted* to *marry* folks *privately*, and other *irregularities*, for a little *spell* of *money*, when they have never a *penny* in their *pockets?* or to please a good *benefactor*, upon whom they *live?*

And yet, after all, to make a *summary conclusion* upon the whole matter, notwithstanding all these *disadvantages*, let us make this *experiment*, to take any *number* of clergymen, without *picking* or *choosing*, just as they lie; suppose through any *two* or *three streets* in *London*; and take an *equal number* of the *laity*, within that compass, without *picking* or *choosing* likewise; suppose the *masters* of so many *houses*, next to each *church*, or at either ends of the *streets*, or the first you meet with by *chance*; and then see whether in that *equal number* of *clergy* and *laity*, you will find most men of *sobriety* and *virtue?* I doubt not, but upon such a trial, the *clergy*, not only in *England*, but all the *world* over, would be found to have the *advantage* by a great *majority*.

A *blot* is sooner seen in a *gown*, than in another man; and there are several *liberties* which *lay-men* allow themselves,

ſelves, which would give great *offence* in a *clergyman*. This ſhews, that they are under *ſtricter* rules, ſo as their *lives* are more ſtrict.

This makes likewiſe a *corrupt clergyman* to be the *worſt* of *men*. The *corruption* of the *beſt* things is the *worſt*. A corrupt *angel* is a *devil*, and a corrupt *prieſt* is next to him in *wickedneſs*.

And there is no more *ſenſe* in the word *prieſt-craft* than in that of *angel-craft*. It is no more *reflection* upon *prieſts*, than upon *angels*. But it is a ſuperlative degree of the *black-angel-craft* to delight in *lyes*, and give falſe *repreſentations*, thereby to deceive the *people*, and lead the *blind* out of their way.

And from what has been before quoted out of this *Secret Hiſtory*, I leave the reader to judge whether any did ever better deſerve the title of *the Accuſer of the Brethren!*

Of which I could give further inſtances, if I were not afraid to tire the reader, who, I ſuppoſe, will think what has been ſaid is ſufficient for that purpoſe.

Yet I will venture upon his patience, to mention one particular more, and ſo have done.

The aſſaſſination of the lord arch-biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s.

It is the relation given in this *Secret Hiſtory* of the *murder* of the lord arch-biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s in *Scotland*, by the *preſbyterians* there, *May* 3, 1679. of which this *hiſtory* ſays, *one of them fired a piſtol at him, which burnt his coat and gown, but the ſhot did not go into his body*.

For what end this is told you ſhall ſee preſently. But firſt, for the falſhood of it, I refer to the *certificate* of the *doctor* of *phyſick* and *three chirurgeons*, who, by order of the *privy-council* in *Scotland*, did view and embalm the *body* of the lord arch-biſhop, which is upon record in the *council-books*, and inſerted in *the Spirit of Popery ſpeaking out of the mouths of Phanatical Proteſtants*, p. 58. printed for *Walter Kettleby*, at the *biſhop*'s-*head* in St. *Paul*'s *church-yard*, 1680; where likewiſe is told the reaſon why this *lye* was propagated by the *party*, viz. to countenance another *diabolical* invention of theirs, which

which they gave about, that the arch-bishop was a *wizard*, and had purchased a magical spell from the *devil*, to keep him shot-free.

They were not failing in their *industry* (they never are) to carry on their *lyes*, but, as told *ibid.* p. 55. they published a scandalous and lying *narrative* concerning the *death* of the *arch-bishop*. and their *party* in *London* spread their *reports* with their usual assurance. And on the *margin* are quoted *in particular by* Dr. J. *and* Dr. B. This was published presently after the *assassination*. And in answer to it, a *true account* of that *horrid murder* was published by *authority*, the same year 1679, printed at *London* for *Andrew Forrester* in *King-street, Westminster*. But this not stopping their *foul mouths*, another *Narrative, drawn out of the records of the Privy-Council of* Scotland, *and from the Depositions of many Witnesses examined upon oath before the Honourable Board*, &c. was annexed to the *Spirit of Popery*, the next year 1680; which has since *silenced* their *clamours*, being undeniable matter of fact. But their *malice* is not conquered.

For here is an *history* provided, which is designed to be kept *secret*, till these *proofs* may be forgotten; and his *account* of *persons* and *things* be taken for *truth!* And thus he represents those passages, after saying, That *the shot did not go into his body*, he adds, *upon which a report was afterwards spread, that he had purchased a magical secret for securing him against shot. And his murderers gave it out that there were very suspicious things found in a purse about him.* But who found that *purse?* His *assassinators* did not *rob* him, nor staid to *search* him; but having performed their *murdering work*, rid away with what *haste* they could. The historian adds (for I will do him all the right I can) *But it was no wonder to find those that murdered his person endeavour to blacken his reputation.* But did this *historian* say any thing to justify his *reputation?* No; but having positively *asserted* the *lye*, upon which this *slander* was founded, he left it to shift for it self. Let *slander* run——But he pursues him with a *stroke* more barbarous than any the *assassinators* gave him,

him, and says, *He* (the arch-bishop) *begged his life in a very abject manner of them, and was in great disorder.* The contrary of which appears in the *Narrative* last quoted. No man could shew a more *Christian courage* and *resolution*. He gave them caution of *shedding* innocent *blood*; and when he saw they were resolved to *murder* him, he prayed them to spare his *daughter*, who was with him in the *coach*, and to give him a small space of time to recommend his *soul* to *God*, which they refused, saying, *God would not hear the prayers of such a dog*; and *cut* and *mangled* his *hands*, while he held them up in *prayer*, even for *them*, that *God* would *forgive* them; which were the *last words* he uttered, while they were *hacking* and *hewing* of him. No history since St. *Stephen* can shew a greater example of *composure* of *mind*, and true Christian *magnanimity*, under so sudden and cruel a *martyrdom*. For so no doubt it was, in a *bishop* being *massacred* by *schismatical zealots*, for no other reason, but their *good old cause*. And the *zealots* of that *cause* do still think that this was no *murder*, but a glorious asserting of the *cause* of *God*, as they *blasphemously* called it! And it is told in the *Narrat.* p. 65. *That five of their accomplices, complotters, and abetters of the murder, chose to die, and be hung up in chains upon the place, rather than confess the sinfulness of the action, by acknowledging it was murder, or a sin.* And these *assassinators* were made chief *commanders* in their *army*, which they raised presently after this *massacre* of the *arch-bishop* and *primate* of *Scotland*, and marched to *Bothwell-Bridge*, where they *fought* it out, in open *rebellion*, against the *king*.

But this *secret historian* gives a stroke to excuse the *party*, and in a great measure the *ruffians* themselves from the *heinousness* of this *murder*, as if it were done by *chance* only, and a sudden *heat*. He says, *Some of them have since given it out, that they had not resolved on doing this any time before, but seeing his coach appear alone in the moor, they took their resolution all on the sudden.* The falshood of this he could not but know, if he took

the leaſt pains to ſearch the *records* of the *council* (and he loves to ſearch *records*) or had ever read any of the *Narratives* before mentioned, which were then very publick, and wherein he himſelf was concerned; for there the *deſign*, and *concerting* of it is evidently made appear; beſides the pretty *probability*, that ſo many men, living at diſtant places, ſhould happen to meet, in a wild *moor* or *heath*, ſo *armed* with *piſtols*, *blunderbuſſes*, &c. and juſt at that nick of time that his *grace*'s coach paſſed through; or could have taken ſuch a *reſolution*, on ſuch a *ſudden*, which would have *aſtoniſhed* any man who had the leaſt *drachm* of *Chriſtianity*, or common *humanity*!

But all theſe things notwithſtanding, this *author* ſets down the *ſuggeſtion*, without any *confutation*, he gueſſed it would take with ſome!

And he *charitably* concludes, *This was the diſmal fate of that unhappy man, who certainly needed a little more time to have fitted him for an unchangeable ſtate. But I would fain hope that he had all his puniſhment in that terrible concluſion of his life.*

This is his *celebration* of the *memory* of a *martyr* for *epiſcopacy*! For other *crime* the worſt of his *enemies* cannot object againſt him. Nor did his *murderers* object any other, when they *reviled* him, and told him why they *killed* him, for being an *apoſtate*; for he was a *convert* from *preſbytery*, and, as they ſaid, for the ſake of a *biſhoprick*.

And ſo they ſay of *others*; yet they are not angry with them, though they have been *converted*, and *reconverted*, and *converted* over again!

The reaſon is, that *Sharp* (as this *hiſtorian* reſpectfully calls the *lord primate*, for that was his name) after he profeſſed *epiſcopacy*, was *true* to it, and to that *church* in which he took ſo high a *ſtation*. He did not *revile* and *beſpatter* her *biſhops* and *clergy*, and repreſent them as *the vileſt ſet of men in the nation*! and give the moſt *malicious*, *falſe* and *ſcandalous* accounts of them! He came among them as a *true convert* and a *friend*, not as a *ſpy*,

a *spy*, to *betray* and *undermine* them, to do them more mischief than 100 open *enemies!*

From the *relation* here given of the *martyrdom* of the great arch-bishop, and the handsome *turns* in *alleviation* of the *fanatical* rage which murdered him; other men, who have been faithful to the *church*, and to the *crown*, may imagine how they may be represented to *posterity*, if this *Secret History* be not *seen* and *corrected* in time, or else totally *suppressed*.

But what I have seen of it, to *correct* it, would be to *alter* the *whole*; for upon every little *circumstance* his *bias* is visible against the *king* and the *clergy*. Telling of the *dissolution* of the *Oxford parliament*, he says, *That the king came to the parliament in a very undecent manner, being carried in a chair to the house of lords, with the crown between his legs, and having sent for the house of commons, he pulled it out from thence, and put it upon his head, and so dissolved the parliament.* This was utterly *false* in *fact*, for the *regalia* were carried by the *king*'s servants and guards to the room, where his majesty robed himself before he went into the *house* of *lords*. But this senseless story was raised by the *faction*, in *ridicule* of the *king*; and so ease their *spleen*, for the brisk *disappointment* he gave to their *plot*, just upon the point of *execution*. And this *historian* chimes in with them, in this, as in every thing else.

Upon this juncture the *king* issued a *declaration*, giving the extraordinary reasons which moved him to *dissolve* the *parliament*; which produced very loyal *addresses* from all parts of the *kingdom* to his *majesty*, *signifying their resolution to stand by the king, and the hereditary succession in the true line.* These *addresses* the *historian* calls *fulsome stuff* (a mighty *word* with him) and falls severely upon the *bishops* and *clergy*, as the *contrivers* or *pen-men* of them; calls them the *king*'s *heralds*, in contempt, and spends his *rhetorick* to shew how little it became them. And upon this, as upon every other occasion, he repeats his accusation of their *loose lives*, and that *their business was to drink the duke's health*, &c.

He ſays of himſelf, that after the *diſſolution* of this *parliament* (it was a ſore mortification to all the *whigs*) *he did betake himſelf to a more ſtrict courſe of life, than he had formerly accuſtomed himſelf to. That he had formerly been too much elevated and carried away with the applauſes of men, and had been given to a looſeneſs in his life, which he would for the time to come remember with ſorrow of heart. That he gave himſelf then to faſting and prayer, and doubted not but the fruits of it would remain with him. That it had made him more humble, more watchful, and more charitable to the failings of others*, &c.

Flaming *charity* indeed, as we have ſeen! He was then in the *dumps*, upon the *king*'s vigorous and unexpected defeating of the *conſpiracy* framed to have ſeized his majeſty, *&c.* which puts them all to their *prayers!*

Ægrotat dæmon, monachus tunc eſſe volebat.

But having recovered their wicked *ſpirits* in a little time,

Dæmon ut ante fuit.

They fell to their old trade of *plotting*, *lying*, *defaming*, *&c.*

How is it poſſible a man ſhould know himſelf ſo little, as that he ſhould talk at this *ſanctified* rate, and perhaps believe himſelf, while he was paſſing the moſt *uncharitable* cenſures at leaſt, if they had not been *falſe*, upon the *lives* of other men, and upon their *death* too, as of the *arch-biſhop* before mentioned! Was this being *charitable* to the *failings* of others? He ought not to *inſult* over the *death* of another, who knows not the *manner* in which his own *end* may be. I wiſh he may have more time for *preparation*, whenever that *day* comes, than was allowed to that martyred *biſhop*. All men are not equally *fitted* for a *ſudden* death; and as a *preparation* in time, I would earneſtly recommend to him, to *conſider* ſeriouſly, and *repent* of the *hard ſpeeches* he has uttered againſt his *brethren*, and not to *flatter* himſelf,

that he is *humble*, and *watchful*, and *charitable*, while he gives such *characters* of men, not to *amend* them, or prevent *evils* he apprehends they have in *design*; which would make it *charitable* indeed, and *necessary*, to give others *warning* of them, not to be *seduced* by them; and in such case ought to be pressed home, as far as *truth* will carry it; but where none of these ends can be served by it, but only to leave a *stigmatizing* mark upon their *memories* to *posterity*, and of the *church* with them; this is far from *charity*, and looks liker the gratification of *spleen* and *resentment*, and an *imbittered* mind. *Reason* would suggest this.

IV. The character of an enthusiast.

But the *spirit* of *enthusiasm* puts out the *eye* of *reason*, and destroys the *sobriety* of *religion*; leaves a man no *principle* or *rule*, but that of *imagination* and *impulses*; can make him believe that he is in the *exaltation* of *charity*, while he is in the very *gall* of *bitterness*, and *delighting himself* in the *sin* of *Ham*. He is not *afraid* to speak *evil* of *dignities*, to *revile* and *bespatter* both *church* and *state*, to *expose* the *nakedness* of *father* and *mother*; and can persuade himself, that all this is out of an high *sense*, and *zeal* to the *glory* of *God!* This can sanctify *schism* and *rebellion* in his eyes! and in short, he can do no *evil*, because he thinks every thing that he does to be *good*, for he has an *impulse* for it! He *imitates* nothing of the *apostles*, but their *miracles!* turns *religion* into *romance*, and will do nothing *ordinary!* he keeps himself in a *sphere* above other *mortals*, whence he looks down upon them with *disdain*, which he calls *pity!* his own *infirmities*, if he sees any in himself, he calls *human frailties*; but all others *offend* of *malicious wickedness!* He is of all men the most *impatient* of *contradiction*, or any *reflection* upon his *reputation*; and yet he seeketh not *honour* of *men!* and thinks himself an *holy* and *humble* man of *heart!* He is all made up of *contradictions! proud* in his *humility! meek* in his *rage! charitable* in *railing! zealous* in *lying! patient* in his *revenge!* for *unity* in *schism!* and *loyal* in his *rebellion!* He knows

 nothing

nothing *truly!* and *himself* least of all! an *hypocrite* to himself! he is every thing but what he is! he is *proof* against *reason!* there is no method with him, but *exorcism!* And now I think it is time to have done with him.

I have one word more to the *author* of the *Occasional Letter*, which is, that he would advise his *friend* to publish his *excellent history*, rather than have it come out upon him by *piece-meal*; for I can assure him, there are several other *passages* in what is *transcribed*, of the like strain with those that are *quoted*, which are forced out by your *objections*, one or two at a time, to see if that may *prevent* the rest, by obliging the *author* to *review* his *history*, and *correct* the *remainder*; and then to *publish* it, or else to *burn* it, that it may not do *mischief* in after *times*. If the last be not his resolution, it may then be thought requisite to publish what is forth-coming of it, with necessary *remarks*, in vindication of *truth*, of the *church*, and those *reigns* and *persons* which are *aspersed*. And as to the *probity* and *honesty* of the *transcriber*, there are *vouchers* as many as knew him. And for his *hand*, there are several can *swear* to it (of which I am one.) He likewise made large *remarks* upon that part of the *history* which he *transcribed* all *wrote* in his own hand, which, when published, may help to ease the *author* of that *temptation* he said lay so hard upon him, the *applauses* of men!

Among these *remarks* there is one (which I will not repeat) upon a passage in that history, which the *author* ought to clear up, because, however he meant it, it may pass hereafter as a *reflection* on the memory of K. *W*. He writes that at the time of the *bill* of *exclusion* against the *duke* of *York*, the *prince* of *Orange* gave *instructions* to Mein heir——*Fagell* (to the best of my remembrance) who was sent by the states of *holland* to K. *Char*. II. that he should deal with some *members* of the *house* of *commons*, to promote the passing of that *bill*. If this was meant a *compliment* to his *highness*, to shew his early *zeal*, and sharp *fore-sight* of *popery*, I cannot tell.

But others may put other *constructions* upon this underhand *attempt* against his *father*, if it was true. However it shews the *author* to have been at the bottom of the *secrets* from the beginning, or that he would be thought so to have been, even at that time when, being *proscribed* his *country*, not for *building* of *churches*, he sent from *Holland* those *letters* (often quoted) full of *loyalty* and *passive obedience*. And, as the *remarker* observes, and gives good reason to believe, he, who owns himself so great a *manager* in the *bill* of *exclusion* (though he discovered so much of it to the *duke*, as to secure himself on that side too) and in the *secrets* of that *party* more than even *Carstares* himself, was not ignorant of the *train* of their *designs*, at the *Rye-House* it self, and at the *Oxford parliament*, &c. And having been so signally *instrumental* in the *revolution*, and as himself gives us to understand, entrusted with the *secret* all along from the *bill* of *exclusion*, he might *modestly* have expected not to see *two*, who came in at the eleventh hour, put over his head, who had born the *burden* and *heat* of the *day*. And if he *blabbed* this *secret* of the *prince* of *Orange*, or *invented* it, he was sufficiently revenged of that old *proverb*, *To love the treason, but hate the tr*——

V. Conclusion upon the bill of occasional conformity.

Upon the *whole* that has been said, in this and the former *part*, let us come to a *conclusion*.

The *bill* concerning *occasional conformity* has been the great *bone* of *debate*, and subject of a multitude of *pamphlets*. As to the *argument*, there is nothing in it; nor is it pleaded upon any other account than that of *places*; so that the whole *dispute* is about *power*: whether that is to be trusted in the hands of the *dissenters*? And it is not *doubted* but that it is extremely *dangerous* both to the *church*, and to the *government*, from what the *dissenters* have formerly done, and the same *principles* which they still *maintain*; besides the natural desire of *power*, which is common to all *parties*; for which of them would not have the *whole* in their own hands, if they could? All *arguments* against this are *trifling*.

But

But the *considerations* which threw this *bill* out of the *house* of *lords*, were the *unseasonableness* of it at this time of *war*; and the necessity therefore of *unity* among our selves.

As to the first, if the *dissenters* think this time of *war* the fittest for their *struggling* to get into *power*: Is it not as incumbent upon the *church* and the *government* to *secure* themselves? it may be too *late* afterwards. If *part* of a *garrison* are *struggling* for the *power* against the *governour* and the *officers* whom he employs, his first work must be (though the *city* be *besieged*, and the rather for that) to *secure* his *government*, and assert his *authority*, else, he may be thrown over the *walls* to his *enemies*, and all the party *sacrificed* who are *faithful* to him. And the putting the *mutineers* into the *posts* they desired, would *strengthen* them against him, and double his *danger*, especially if there were *another*, whom they would rather have *governour* than him, and he near at hand to be called.

And as to the point of *unity*, it is very difficult to adjust it betwixt *parties* that contend for *power*. And if the *church* or the *dissenters* must be *obliged*, it should not seem hard to *determine* which of them it should be; unless that *notion* still prevails of trusting to the *passive-obedience-doctrine* of the *church!* And whether the *lords* rejecting that *bill* has produced the desired *unity* betwixt the two *houses*, and consequently betwixt the contending *parties* through the *kingdom?* I leave it to time to determine more fully; and whether it will prevent the like *bill* coming in again next *session?* And if it *miscarry* again, whether that will likely *heal* or *heighten* the *animosities?* But let it be remembered, that the *rejecting* this *bill* gave the first occasion.

There was a *politick* once mightily cried out upon, which seems now more convenient to some people, that is, to *gratify* your *enemies*, for your *friends* will be your *friends* still!

But, besides the *justice* and *generosity* of such a *principle!* I believe *experience* has since *convinced* us, that

It is much easier to lose *a* friend, *than to gain an* enemy.

And that where there is a *competition*, it is *impossible* to *please* both. It will more certainly *lose* both; for *jealousy* has *hawk's eyes*.

It has proved a false *maxim* in *politicks*,

Two strings *to your* bow;

For,

Such a bow *never shoots* true.

FINIS Coronat Opus.

APPENDIX.

A DECLARATION BY THE KING's MAJESTY,

To his ſubjects of the kingdoms of *Scotland*, *England*, and *Ireland*, printed at *Edinburgh*, 1650.

HIS Majeſty taking in conſideration, that merciful diſpenſation of Divine Providence, by which he hath been recovered out of the ſnare of evil counſel; and having attained ſo full perſuaſion and confidence of the loyalty of his people in *Scotland*, with whom he hath too long ſtood at a diſtance, and of the righteouſneſs of their cauſe, as to join in one covenant with them, and to caſt himſelf and his intereſts wholly upon God, and in all matters civil to follow the advice of his parliament, and ſuch as ſhall be intruſted by them; and in all

ters ecclesiastick, the advice of the general assembly and their commissioners; and being sensible of his duty to God, and desirous to approve himself to the consciences of all his good subjects, and to stop the mouths of his and their enemies, and traducers, doth, in reference to his former deportments, and as to his resolutions for the future, declare as follows.

Though his majesty, as a dutiful son, be obliged to honour the memory of his royal father, and have in estimation the person of his mother; yet doth he desire to be deeply humbled and afflicted in spirit, before God, because of his father's hearkening to, and following evil counsels; and his opposition to the work of reformation; and to the solemn league and covenant, by which so much of the blood of the Lord's people hath been shed in these kingdoms; and for the idolatry of his mother; the toleration whereof in the king's house, as it was matter of great stumbling to all the protestant churches; so could it not but be an high provocation against him *who is a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children*; albeit his majesty might extenuate his former carriages and actions, in following of the advice, and walking in the way of those who are opposite to the covenant and to the work of God, and might excuse his delaying to give satisfaction to the just and necessary desires of the kirk and kingdom of *Scotland*, from his education, and age, and evil counsel, and company; and from the strange and insolent proceedings of sectaries against his royal father; and in reference to religion and the antient government of the kingdom of *England*, to which he hath the undoubted right of succession: yet knowing that he hath to do with God, he doth ingenuously acknowledge all his own sins, and all the sins of his father's house, craving pardon, and hoping for mercy and reconciliation through the blood of Jesus Christ. And as he doth value the constant addresses that were made by his people to the throne of grace on his behalf, when he stood in opposition to the work of God, as a singular testimony of long suffering, patience and mercy upon the

the Lord's part, and loyalty upon theirs; so doth he hope, and shall take it as one of the greatest tokens of their love and affection to him, and to his government, that they will continue in prayer and supplication to God for him; that the Lord who spared and preserved him to this day, notwithstanding of all his own guiltiness, may be at peace with him, and give him to fear the Lord his God, and to serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind all the days of his life.

And his majesty having upon full persuasion of the justice and equity of all the heads and articles thereof, now sworn and subscribed the national covenant of the kingdom of *Scotland*, and the solemn league and covenant of the three kingdoms of *Scotland*, *England*, and *Ireland*, doth declare, that he hath not sworn and subscribed these covenants, and entered into the oath of God with his people, upon any sinister intention or crooked design for attaining his own ends, but so far as human weakness will permit, in the truth and sincerity of his heart, and that he is firmly resolved in the Lord's strength to adhere thereto, and to prosecute to the utmost of his power, all the ends thereof, in his station and calling, really, constantly and sincerely all the days of his life: in order to which he doth in the first place profess and declare, that he will have no enemies but the enemies of the covenant, and that he will have no friends but the friends of the covenant. And therefore as he does now detest and abhor all popery, superstition, and idolatry; together with prelacy and all errors, heresy, schism, and profaneness; and resolves not to tolerate, much less allow any of these, in any part of his majesty's dominions; but to oppose himself thereto, and to endeavour the extermination thereof to the utmost of his power; so doth he as a Christian exhort, and as a king require, that all such of his subjects, who have stood in opposition to the solemn league and covenant, and work of reformation, upon a pretence of kingly interest, or any other pretext whatsomever, to lay down their enmity against the cause and

people of God, and to ceaſe to prefer the intereſts of man to the intereſt of God; which hath been one of thoſe things which hath occaſioned many troubles and calamities in theſe kingdoms, and being inſiſted into, will be ſo far from eſtabliſhing the king's throne, that it will prove an idol of jealouſy to provoke into wrath him who is King of kings, and Lord of lords. The king ſhall always eſteem them beſt ſervants, and moſt loyal ſubjects, who ſerve him, and ſeek his greatneſs in a line of ſubordination unto God; giving unto God the things that are God's, and unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's; and reſolveth not to love or countenance any who have ſo little conſcience and piety as to follow his intereſts with a prejudice to the goſpel and the kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt; which he looks not upon as a duty, but as flattering and driving of ſelf-deſigns, under a pretence of maintaining the royal authority and greatneſs. Secondly, his majeſty being convinced in conſcience of exceeding great ſinfulneſs and unlawfulneſs of that treaty and peace made with the bloody *Iriſh* rebels, who treacherouſly ſhed the blood of ſo many of his faithful and loyal ſubjects in *Ireland*, and of allowing unto them the liberty of popiſh religion; for the which he doth from his heart deſire to be deeply humbled before the Lord, and likewiſe conſidering how many breaches have been upon their part, doth declare the ſame to be void, and that his majeſty is abſolved therefrom, being truly ſorry that he ſhould have ſought unto ſo unlawful help for reſtoring of him to the throne, and reſolving for the time to come, rather to chooſe affliction than ſin. Thirdly, as his majeſty did in the late treaty with his people in this kingdom, agree to recal and annul all commiſſions againſt any of his ſubjects, who did adhere to the covenant and monarchical government in any of his kingdoms: ſo doth he now declare by commiſſionating of ſome perſons by ſea againſt the people of *England*; he did not intend damage or injury to his oppreſſed and harmleſs ſubjects in that kingdom, who follow their trade of merchandize in their lawful callings; but only

only the oppoſing and ſuppreſſing of thoſe who had uſurped the government, and not only bar him from his juſt right, but alſo exerciſe an arbitrary power over his people, in thoſe things which concern their perſon, conſciences and eſtates: and as ſince his coming into *Scotland* he hath given no commiſſion againſt any of his ſubjects in *England* or *Ireland*; ſo he doth hereby aſſure and declare that he will give none to their prejudice or damage, and whatever ſhall be the wrongs of theſe uſurpers, that he will be ſo far from avenging theſe upon any who are free thereof by interrupting or ſtopping the liberty of trade and merchandize, or otherways, that he will ſeek their good, and to the utmoſt employ his royal power, that they may be protected and defended againſt the unjuſt violence of all men whatſoever. And albeit his majeſty deſires to conſtruct well of the intentions of theſe (in reference to his majeſty) who have been active in counſel or arms againſt the covenant, yet being convinced that it doth conduce for the honour of God, the good of his cauſe, and his own honour and happineſs, and for the peace and ſafety of theſe kingdoms, that ſuch be not employed in places of power and truſt; he doth declare that he will not employ nor give commiſſion to any ſuch, until they have not only taken or renewed the covenant, but alſo have given ſufficient evidences of their integrity, carriage, or affection to the work of reformation, and ſhall be declared capable of truſt by the parliament of either kingdom reſpective: and his majeſty, upon the ſame grounds, doth hereby recal all commiſſions given to any ſuch perſons; conceiving all ſuch perſons will ſo much tender a good underſtanding betwixt him and his ſubjects, and the ſettling and preſerving a firm peace in theſe kingdoms, that they will not grudge nor repine at his majeſty's reſolutions, and proceedings therein, much leſs upon diſcontent, act any thing in a way unto the raiſing of new troubles; eſpecially, ſince upon their pious and good deportment, there is a regreſs left unto them in manner above expreſſed.

And as his majesty hath given satisfaction to the just and necessary desires of the kirk and kingdom of *Scotland*, so doth he hereby assure and declare that he is no less willing and desirous to give satisfaction to the just and necessary desires of his good subjects in *England* and *Ireland*; and in token thereof, if the houses of parliament in *England*, sitting in freedom, shall think fit to present to him the propositions of peace agreed upon by both kingdoms, he will not only accord to the same, and such alterations thereon meant as the houses of parliament, in regard of the constitution of affairs, and the good of his majesty's and his kingdoms shall judge necessary, but do what is further necessary for prosecuting the ends of the solemn league and covenant; especially in those things which concern the reformation of the church of *England*, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government. That not only the directory of worship, confession of faith, and catechism; but also the prepositions and directory for church government, accorded upon by the synod of divines at *Westminster* may be settled; and that the church of *England* may enjoy the full liberty and freedom of all assemblies, and power of kirk censures, and of all the ordinances of Jesus Christ; according to the rule of his own word, and that whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven may be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; and whatever heretofore hath been the suggestions of some to him, to render his majesty jealous of his parliament, and of the servants of God; yet as he hath declared, that in *Scotland* he will hearken to their counsel, and follow their advice in those things that concern that kingdom and kirk; so doth he also declare his firm resolution to manage the government of the kingdom of *England* by the advice of his parliament, consisting of an house of lords, and an house of commons there, and in those things that concern religion to prefer the counsels of the ministers of the gospel to all other counsels whatsoever. And that all the world may see how much he tenders the safety of his people, and how

 precious

precious their blood is in his ſight, and how deſirous he is to recover his crown and government in *England* by peaceable means; as he doth eſteem the ſervice of thoſe who firſt engaged in the covenant, and have ſince that time faithfully followed the ends thereof, to be duty to God and loyalty to him; ſo is he willing in regard of others, who have been involved in theſe late commotions in *England* againſt religion and government, to paſs an act of oblivion, excepting only ſome few in that nation, who have been chief obſtructors of the work of reformation, and chief authors of the change of government, and of the murder of his royal father. Provided that thoſe who are to have the benefit of this act, lay down arms, and return into the obedience of their lawful ſovereign.

The committee of the ſtates of the kingdom, and general aſſembly of the kirk of *Scotland*, having declared ſo fully in what concerns the ſectaries and the preſent deſigns, reſolutions, and actings of their army againſt the kingdom of *Scotland*; and the ſaid committee and aſſembly having ſufficiently laid open publick danger and duty, both upon the right hand and upon the left; it is not needful for his majeſty to add any thing thereunto; except that in thoſe things he doth commend and approve them; and that he reſolves to live and die with them and his loyal ſubjects, in proſecution of the ends of the covenant.

And whereas that prevailing party in *England*, after all their ſtrange uſurpations, and inſolent actings in that land, do not only keep his majeſty from the government of that kingdom by force of arms; but alſo have now invaded the kingdom of *Scotland*, who have deſerved better things at their hands, and againſt whom they have no juſt quarrel; his majeſty doth therefore deſire and expect that all his good ſubjects in *England*, who are, and reſolve to be faithful to God and to their king, according to the covenant, will lay hold upon ſuch an opportunity, and uſe their utmoſt endeavours to promote the covenant, all the ends thereof, and to recover

and

and re-eſtabliſh the antient government of the kingdom of *England*, (under which in many generations it did flouriſh in peace and plenty at home, and in reputation abroad) and privileges of the parliament, and native and juſt liberty of the people: his majeſty deſires to aſſure himſelf, that there doth remain in theſe ſo much confidence of their duty to religion, their king and country; and ſo many ſparkles of the antient *Engliſh* valour, which ſhined ſo eminently in their noble anceſtors, as will put them on to beſtir themſelves for the breaking the yoke of theſe men's oppreſſions from off their necks: Shall men of conſcience and honour ſet religion, liberties and government at ſo low a rate, as not rather to undergo any hazard before they be thus deprived of them? Will not all generous men count any death more tolerable than to live in ſervitude all their days? And will not poſterity blame thoſe who dare attempt nothing for themſelves, and for their children, in ſo good a cauſe, in ſuch an exigent? Whereas if they gather themſelves and take courage, putting on a reſolution anſwerable to ſo noble and juſt an enterprize; they ſhall honour God, and gain themſelves the reputation of pious men, worthy patriots, and loyal ſubjects, and be called the *repairers* of the *breach*, by the preſent and ſucceeding generations; and they may certainly promiſe to themſelves a bleſſing from God upon ſo juſt and honourable undertaking for the Lord, and for his cauſe, for their own liberties, their native king and country, and the unvaluable good and happineſs of poſterity. Whatever hath formerly been his majeſty's guiltineſs before God, and the bad ſucceſs that theſe have had, who owned his affairs whilſt he ſtood in oppoſition to the work of God; yet the ſtate of the queſtion being now altered, and his majeſty having obtained mercy to be on God's ſide, and to prefer God's intereſt before his own, he hopes that the Lord will be gracious, and countenance his own cauſe in the hands of weak and ſinful inſtruments, againſt all enemies whatſoever.

This

This is all that can be ſaid by his majeſty at preſent, to thoſe in *England* and *Ireland*, at ſuch a diſtance; and as they ſhall acquit themſelves at this time, in the active diſcharge of their neceſſary duties; ſo ſhall they be accepted before God, endeared to his majeſty, and their names had in remembrance throughout the world.

Given at our court at Dumfermling, *the ſixteenth day of* Auguſt, 1650. *And in the ſecond year of our reign.*

THE

THE DECLARATION OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE General Aſſembly of *Scotland*, As follows:

THE commiſſion of the general aſſembly, conſidering that there may be juſt ground of ſtumbling from the king's majeſty's refuſing to ſubſcribe and emit the declaration offered unto him by the committee of eſtates, and commiſſioners of the general aſſembly concerning his former carriage and reſolutions for the future, in reference to the cauſe of God, and the enemies and friends thereof; doth therefore declare, that this kirk and kingdom do not own or eſpouſe any malignant party or quarrel, or intereſt; but that they fight merely upon their former grounds and principles, and in defence of the cauſe of God, and of the kingdom, as they have done theſe twelve years paſt; and therefore as they do diſclaim all the ſin and guilt of the king and of his houſe; ſo they will not own him nor his intereſt, otherwiſe than with a ſubordination to God, and ſo far as he owns and proſecutes the cauſe of God, and diſclaims his

his father's opposition to the work of God and to the covenant, and likewise all the enemies thereof; and that they will with convenient speed take in consideration the papers lately sent unto them from *Oliver Cromwell*, and vindicate themselves from all the falshoods contained therein, especially in those things wherein the quarrel betwixt us and that party is mis-stated, as if we owned the late king's proceedings, and were resolved to prosecute and maintain his present majesty's interest, before and without acknowledgment of the sins of his house and former ways, and satisfaction to God's people in both kingdoms.

A. KER.

Westkirk,
13 *August*, 1650.

---

13 *August* 1650.

THE committee of estates having seen and considered a declaration of the commission of the general assembly, annent the stating of the quarrel whereon the army is to fight, do approve the same, and heartily concur therein.

THO. HENDERSON.

A LET-

A

LETTER

FROM

Lieutenant General *David Leslie*

TO THE

Lord General *Cromwell.*

MY LORD,

I am commanded by the committee of estates of this kingdom, and desired by the commissioners of the general assembly, to send unto your excellency the enclosed declaration, as that which contained the state of the quarrel, wherein we are resolved, by the Lord's assistance, to fight your army, when the Lord shall please to call us thereunto. And as you have professed you will not conceal any of our papers, I do desire that this declaration may be made known to all the officers of your army, and so I rest

Your excellency's most humble servant,

Bruchton,
13 *August*, 1650.

DAVID LESLIE.

For his excellence the
lord general Cromwell.

Some

Some Obſervations

UPON THIS

DECLARATION.

1. AS to the *king*. I ſuppoſe the reaſon why it has not been publiſhed in our *hiſtories* ſince the *reſtoration*, was out of *reſpect* to his *majeſty*, as caſting a foul *blot* upon him, in *conſenting* to ſuch a *declaration*. And therefore, though they could not avoid mentioning of it, yet they did it as *tenderly* as might be, and have not given us the *whole*.

But conſidering that it was *printed* by the *preſbyterians* in the year 1650; and no doubt is ſtill in their hands, to be *re-publiſhed*, when they ſee opportunity, more to his *majeſty*'s diſadvantage; and that it is no *ſecret*, his *majeſty* was then *compelled* to take the *covenant*: I think it more for his honour, and the *truth* of hiſtory, to let it be ſeen, with all the due *circumſtances* of it, and the *ſteps* by which he was *betrayed* and *forced* into it, by the moſt *extreme neceſſity*; which, conſidering his *age*, then but 20 *years* old, and the *deſperateneſs* of his *condition*, having no other *hole* to *creep* in at into any of his *dominions*; or other viſible *remedy* then left to *ſave* even his *life*, though but for a few days; the *enemy* being juſt at hand, within a few *miles* of him, the ſame *Oliver*, who had *cut off* his *father*'s *head*, and was then *hunting* of him; and the *preſbyterians*, who pretended to *adhere* to him, having actually *renounced* him, upon his *refuſing* to *ſign* that *declaration*, as appears fully by their *act* at the *Weſt-kirk* here ſet down; theſe things are as great *alleviations* on the *king*'s part, as the *temptation* was great,

great, and his *age* tender, not to resolve upon *martyrdom*, as his *father* had done. And it is more for his *honour* to have it thus told, with the true *circumstances* of it, than to leave it to *blacken* his *memory* much more, when his *enemies* shall *publish* it, with false *aggravations*, and the *truth* be forgotten.

It is told before, *Sect.* xv. how the *general assembly* objected against the *king*, the great *unwillingness* and *reluctancy* with which he *signed* this *declaration*; and that he should say afterwards, *He did not think his father guilty of blood; and that notwithstanding he had so declared, he had his own meaning thereof.* This was then made use of as a great *aggravation* against the *king*; but now does fully *justify* him, so far, as that he did not *willingly* cast such a *reflection* upon his royal *father*, or *himself*.

And though I do by no means allow of any *mental* and *equivocal reservations* in any *oath* or *declaration*, which ought to be taken in the known *sense* of the *imposer*. And this was *imposed* on the *king*, though not so *pretended*, and so left him at greater *liberty*; yet even in that case, it ought not to have been done; but if any such practice could be *justified*, there was a *reservation* in this case, which perhaps the *king* meant, and there was too much *truth* in it, *viz.* that the *blood* of that *rebellion* was, in a great measure, occasioned by the *king* his *father*, not *intentionally*, so as to lay the *guilt* upon him, God forbid; but by the effects of his much mistaken *clemency*, in giving way, at the beginning, to those *seditious spirits*, who sought to *wrest* the *government* out of his hands: and for *sparing* his *justice* to a *few*, in time, involved himself, his *family*, and all his *kingdoms*, in *ruin*, not *repaired* to this day! and hardly *reparable*, by the cursed *principles* of *rebellion* these *incendiaries* have left behind. Who, having *prospered* once, *attempted* the like often in the *reigns* of his *sons*, and would *embroil* us again. But to go on with the *declaration*.

2. There was not only no *toleration* for *episcopacy*, but the utter *extirpation* of it decreed, not only in *Scotland*,

land, but in *England*, and all other his *majesty*'s dominions.

3. The *rebels* were declared to have been *faithful* and *loyal* subjects, and to have carried on the *cause* of *God*, in all that they had acted against K. *Cha.* I. and the whole *blood* of the *rebellion* laid upon his head. And that his *defending* himself against them, was opposing the *work* of *God*.

4. All those that had *served* the *king* against them, (whom they called *malignants*) were to be *discarded*. And the *king* engaged, not only not to *employ* them in any *offices* whatsoever, no not in his *family*, not to *cherish* or *countenance* them, but not so much as to *love* them.

And they bestow a bantering *exhortation* upon them, not to *grudge* or *repine!* but to bear it *patiently*, for *peace* sake, and out of their *love* to the king, to let him be at *quiet!* &c.

This came *(decently!)* from those, who, when the king had made a *deed* of *gift* to them of the kingdom of *Scotland* (as before quoted) settled their *presbytery*, and every thing that they could *ask*, were so far from being *quiet* themselves, that, contrary to their *oaths* and *promises*, they *marched* against him with an *army* into *England*, to have their *presbytery* settled there too. And nothing less will *content* them now; as their *Sanquair declaration* speaks *expressly*, and the *new associations* of both their *provincial synods* not *obscurely!*

And they *insult* at the old rate, bid the *episcopal church* there not *grudge* or *repine* that they will allow them no *toleration*, and *persecute* them from *city* to *city*; why should they not bear it, for *peace* sake! and rather than make any *disturbance!* while, at the same time, they are not *content* themselves with a full and free *toleration* in *England*, but will set the whole *nation* in a *flame*, if they are not admitted into all *places* of *power* and *trust!* and *claim* it as their *birth-right!* but the *prelatists* and *malignants* have no *birth-rights!* What should *they* do with *birth-rights!* But to go on.

5. They

5. They *commanded* the king, not only to recal the *commissions* he had given, and to *disband* those who were not *presbyterians*, that were in *arms* for him; but to *acknowledge* that it was *unlawful* to have made use of them, particularly of those his *subjects* in *Ireland*, who had *returned* to their *duty*, and the king had made *peace* and a *treaty* with them, which these *covenanters* here *declare* to be *void*, and the king *absolved* from the *faith* he had given, and that he ought not to *have sought unto so unlawful help for restoring of him to his throne*. And that for the *time to come he should rather choose affliction than sin*; that is, to be *deposed* and *murdered* by the *covenanted rebels*, rather than take the *assistance* of others of his *natural subjects*, pursuant to their bounden *duty* and *allegiance!* But *papists* must not have leave to *repent*, or to be *loyal!* and yet are charged with *disloyalty!* Several of them were sent from *Ireland* to the great *marquess* of *Montrose*, and did signal *service* against the *rebels* of the *covenant*; therefore they could not *endure* them! But they made no *scruple* themselves of employing *papists*, all whom they could *debauch*, on their side against the king, who, in one of his *declarations*, tells the *parliament*, that they had more *papists* in their *army*, than he had in his. But they might *lawfully* break their *allegiance*, and *fight* against their king; but it was *unlawful* for him to make use of them for his own *preservation*, or suffer them to pay their *allegiance* to him!

6. It is plain by this *declaration*, that all they *fought* for, and all the use they had of the king, was to set up *themselves* the *presbyterians*, their *solemn league and covenant*, their *directory*, *confession of faith*, &c. in *England* as well as *Scotland*, against the *sectaries*, as they called the *independents*, and other their *fellow-sectaries*, who had then got the *upper hand* of them, though *born* and *nursed* by them *ungrateful* as they were!

NUM-

NUMB. II.

Edinburgh, *Feb.* 1, 170¼.

MASTER Maſſie, *a* Scottiſh *gentleman, living within nine miles of* Edinburgh, *ſent for Mr.* Burges, *an epiſcopal miniſter to* baptize *his* child: *the preſbyterian* preacher *of the* paroch *commanded his* pariſhioners *to* riſe *(under pain of* excommunication) *and to thruſt out that* intruder *(as he called him.) Whereupon a great many people came to Mr.* Maſſie's *houſe, where they not only abuſed his* wife *very ill, though lying in* child-bed, *but alſo tore all the* miniſter's *cloaths,* beating *him moſt unmercifully, and with much ado were perſuaded to let him have an* old coat, *and ſo be gone. He was twice* beſet *on the* road, *with a deſign to* kill *him with* ſtones, *but it pleaſed God to preſerve his life.*

P. S. Obſerve that Mr. *Burges* hath complied with the *government,* and ſerved as *chaplain* in K. *W.*'s *regiments.*

OBSERVATIONS *on Numb.* II.

This *letter* is but a ſingle *inſtance* of what is *frequent* through that *kingdom*; of which more is told in the *New Aſſociation*; but no *notice* taken, or *anſwer* given in this *Occaſional Letter.* (See likewiſe *Num.* III. of *Appendix* to the *Wolf Stript.*) For it is matter of *fact,* and cannot be *denied*; therefore that *author* did wiſely *ſlip* it.

But there is *another* ſince, for whom nothing is too hard, who has *printed* a *book* called, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Scotland, *which met at* Edinburgh, *May* 6, 1703, in anſwer to another *relation* of it, which is intituled, *The proceedings of the Parliament of* Scotland, *&c.* which is quoted in the foregoing ſheets. And he undertakes to prove the very *good uſage* which the *epiſcopal clergy* and thoſe of their *communion* meet with in *Scotland.* For which reaſon I have publiſhed

lished this *letter* come now to hand. And several others, to the like purpose, I have seen.

However, nothing can be a clearer *proof*, than the *answers* which this *author* of the *account* gives. He comes in his *Preface*, p. 3. to what was said in *the proceedings* of the *male-treatment* of the *episcopal clergy* at *Edinburgh*. And he puts it off thus, that the *instances* were *too general*; and says he, *I am at too great a distance for a speedy enquiry*. It seems then, he was in too great *haste* with his *book*, that he could not stay for *information*, before he pretended to give an *answer!* But there is a great deal of *slander* and *malice* in his *book*; and the *party* could not want it so long!

But how could a person of that *kingdom*, who gives us *news* every day from thence, and is acquainted with so many of the *Scotsmen* now in *London*, especially of the *whig side*, who were then at *Edinburgh*, and sat in the *parliament* there, and from whom he received the *particulars* of his long *account* of their *proceedings*; how could this man want *information* of what was publick at that time in *Edinburgh?* at least, he might, in the return of a *post*, have had full *information* from thence; where his *correspondents* lie, who furnish him *weekly* with *news*.

But there is a more shameless *come-off* even than this, in his *book*, p. 11, 12, where he would solve the *rabbling* of an *episcopal meeting* at *Glasgow*, who had the *protection* of the *privy council*, pursuant to her *majesty*'s gracious *letters* on their behalf, which is told in the *New Association*, Part II. *Supplement*, p. 1, 2, 14.

1. He calls it a *Jacobite conventicle*; though care was taken by the *privy-council*, that the *clergyman* whom they sent to *officiate* there, was one who had *qualified* himself according to *law*, and taken the *oaths* required by the *government*. But he was *episcopal*, that was the whole cause; and there was nothing of *Jacobitism*, not one tittle appeared in the whole case, but purely the point of *conscience* as to *episcopacy* and *presbytery*, for which I refer you to their *petition* to the *queen*, which is inserted in the *Wolf Stript*, Append. *Num.* III. Therefore

fore this *author* calling them *Jacobites* was only an *ill word* to *scold* with, as they call the *church* of *England papishes!* and our *Common Prayer* the *mass* in *English!* But this *clergyman* who *officiated* at *Glasgow*, gave greater *proof* of his affection to the *government*, than several *presbyterian ministers* now in *places*, who refused the *oaths*, and have not taken them to this day. Which being told in the *proceedings*, is owned for truth in the *account*, Pref. p. 2. And the *quakers* instanced in justification, who have a *scruple* about *oaths*. Would such an *excuse* have passed from the *episcopal clergy*, if they had pleaded *quakerism*, for not taking the *oaths!* And why may not some of them have *scruples*, as well as the *presbyterians!*

2. But this *advocate* of theirs has a better *reason* to *clear* them from that *rabbling* at *Glasgow*, in his *account*, p. 11. which is, that the *episcopal meeting* there did set the *mob* upon *themselves!* Though they were not *armed*, nor made any *resistance*, several of them were *hurt* and *wounded*, and the *clergyman* who *officiated* hardly *escaped*; Sir *John Bell*'s house, where they met, was *gutted*, and his very *gardens* destroyed, and his eldest son *wounded*. And in that *city*, which is the *second* in the *kingdom* for *greatness*, and the most *presbyterian* and *whig* of any other, the very *nest* of them, where the *rabbling* of the *episcopal clergy* and *churches*, then *established* by *law*, in the beginning of this *revolution*, was carried on with the utmost *barbarity*, which I have from *eye-witnesses*; and several *circumstances* of their *cruelty*, especially of what they call their *white regiment* of *women*, kept on foot for this very purpose, cannot be told for the filthy *obscenity* of them, which cost one of the clergy, then *preaching*, his *life*, who was thus treated by them in the *church*, if not in the *pulpit*; and the worthy Mr. *Toland*, since well known, then a *student* in that *University*, was a principal man at heading the mob, and *hallooing* them at the clergy; and this *white regiment* was up, at this last *rabbling* of which we are now speaking; and *Maggy Steen*, their colonel, was in consult with some of the

presbyterian ministers and magistrates the night before; is it not very likely then, that in this place, and under these *circumstances*, a *few* of the episcopal persuasion, *unarmed*, and in no posture of *defence*, should raise this mob upon themselves, which might have cost them their *lives?* and probably had, if my lord *Kilmaers* had not come in with some forces he commanded there to their rescue; whom this *author* calls *Jacobite* ruffians, who *drew their swords and quarrelled with the boys, and others they found in the streets*. This was the *innocent* and *godly mob*, then *assaulting* Sir *John Bell*'s house, where the episcopal meeting was kept! And this was the manner in which he tells, that they raised this *tumult* upon *themselves!* and calls it a *Jacobite outrage!* and says they were resolved on a *tumult*, and *feared the moderation* of the people. Why did they not let the *mob* alone, and see the *utmost* they would have done? But they *feared* their *moderation!* and it was the *soldiers* raised the *tumult*; for it is the *second blow* that makes the *quarrel*. There had been no *disturbance*, though they had murdered every man in that *meeting*, if no resistance had been made, and the soldiers had not come in, and *disturbed* that *godly work!* There is no *disturbance*, when a *butcher* kills a *sheep*.

But how came it, that the *privy-council*, who examined this matter, did not *punish* these *Jacobites* who raised this *tumult?* but, on the contrary, ordered the *magistrates* to *repair* the *damages* done to Sir *John Bell*'s *house*; and, for the future, to *protect* that *episcopal meeting*, pursuant to her *majesty*'s orders, or otherwise threatened to send more *forces* among them, to *teach* them their *duty*. Notwithstanding these *presbyterian magistrates* had the *grace* to refuse to do either! why then were not the *forces* sent? This *author* tells, p. 11. that the *presbyterian* party were so strong in the *privy-council* as to nder it. Then sure they were so strong as not to have uffered the *reflection* of that *tumult* to be laid upon the noneſt *presbyterians*, if there had been no *cause* for it, but that the *Jacobites* had raised it upon themselves! He con-

confesses, p. 12. that the *inhabitants* of *Glasgow* did *drive them out of their conventicles set up against law.* Why? though *episcopacy* was *abolished*, by *act* of their own *parliament*, from being the *established* religion; was it made *unlawful* for them to have any *liberty* of *conscience*, and to serve *God* in their *houses*, when they were turned out of their *churches?* Or, was not the *queen*'s authority *sufficient*; or their *regard* for her *majesty* so great, as to *gratify* her (if it had been no more) in so *small* a matter, as to suffer one *episcopal meeting?* And why would they not let the *privy-council* be *judges* of this, since they own that the *major* part of them were on their side? Or, had they a private *watch-word?*

But this *author*, giving his reasons, why the *presbyterians* refuse any *toleration* to the episcopal party in *Scotland*, says, p. 57. that *for such of the* episcopal clergy *as have taken the oaths to her majesty, there is no need of it, they may preach and pray whenever they can procure an auditory; for there is no law against it.* Now this was the case of that episcopal meeting at *Glasgow*, for the clergyman who did *officiate* there, had taken the *oaths*; and as such, was sent by the now *privy-council*, pursuant to her majesty's gracious *letters*; which, it seems, were not contrary to *law*, yet were *opposed!* And this *author*'s justification of it is, that they *drove out a conventicle set up against law!* and they will suffer none *other* there to this day, though the episcopal party there have humbly *petitioned* her majesty for it, but cannot *obtain* it, for *fear* of the *presbyterians!* Why did the *magistrates* of *Glasgow* answer the *privy-council*, that they could not undertake to *protect* any episcopal meeting there, as they were *commanded?* especially considering that *there was no law against it.* Could not they *protect* the *laws* against a few *Jacobites?* (as this author calls them) or hinder them from *rabbling* of *themselves!* Why did they oppose *forces* going down against them? Why does this *author* say, p. 12. that *had not the sending of forces thither been wisely prevented*——Scotland *had unavoidably been thrown into greater convulsions and dis-*

orders, than any that have happened ſince the reſtoration of K. Char. *the ſecond?* This is fair *warning!* And theſe are grateful men!

Had they *forgot*, that when epiſcopacy was eſtabliſhed, in the year 1669, *and afterwards* (as it is expreſſed in the *Glaſgow petition* before mentioned) K. *Char.* II. *did grant even to the preſbyterians and their preachers, as much, if not more, than we now humbly* addreſs *for, although they were equal enemies to himſelf, as to the monarchy.*

And has their *addreſs* to king *James* 7th quite ſlipt out of their minds (which therefore to *refreſh* their *memories*, is *re-printed* in the *Appendix* to *Wolf Stript, Num.* 1. p. 3, 4.) wherein they give many *thanks* for the *indulgence* he granted them, and promiſed perpetual *loyalty*, upon their *word* and *conſcience?* which they *religiouſly* performed! as to his *father!* ſo hitherto to his *daughter!* whoſe leaſt *commands* (or *deſires*) they diſpute *inch* by *inch!*

And the return of *gratitude* which they made to theſe *princes* for their great *clemency* to them (plentifully by them *acknowledged*, at the time) was to raiſe *rebellions* againſt them, while they *lived*; and after their *death*, to *blacken* their *memory* as the moſt *cruel* of *tyrants!*

Thus this *account* gives a long *detail* of the ſharp *acts* made againſt the *preſbyterians* in *Scotland*, during theſe *reigns*, but ſays not a word of the *cauſe* of it, and even *neceſſity* which *forced* the *parliament* (they forgot that) as well as the *king* to make theſe *laws*, to preſerve the *nation* from the daily *murders*, *aſſaſſinations*, and *rebellions* of theſe *people*, the like I believe not heard in any *Chriſtian* country! They not only ſet up *declarations* downright *diſowning* the *king*, and *preaching* it as every man's duty to *kill* him, but all who *obeyed* him, or *ſerved* him. And they have *murdered* the *ſoldiers* whom they found *ſingle* travelling the *road*, for no other reaſon, but becauſe they ſaw the *king*'s *livery* upon their *backs!* and when *taken*, and brought to *execution*, had their *lives* offered them, upon no harder condition than only

only to ſay theſe words, *God ſave the king!* No! they would not buy their *lives* ſo dear! and would ſuffer death rather than do it! But when their *right hands* were cut off (which is part of the *ſentence* for *treaſon* there) ſprinkled their *blood* upon the *people*, calling it *(blaſphemouſly!) the blood of the covenant.* This is the ſame traiterous *covenant* they have now *renewed*, ſince her *majeſty*'s acceſſion to the *throne*; and which they think the very *covenant* of *God!* And they *baptize* their *children* into it! it is frequently given in *charge* at their *baptiſms*, with their *confeſſion* of *faith*, &c. This is in *lieu* of the *ſign* of the *croſs!* and this allows of no *king* or *queen* who will not take it. This has made them renounce queen *Anne*, and for the ſame reaſon they gave againſt her *uncle* K. *Char.* II. becauſe ſhe is *epiſcopal*; for they will have none but a *preſbyterian* to reign over *them!*

When the *duke* of *York* was *commiſſioner* in *Scotland*, he could not believe it *poſſible*, what was told him; that men could be *poſſeſſed* with ſuch a *frenetical ſpirit* of *furious* and *unchriſtian zeal*, as to ſcruple ſaying, *God ſave the king*, which is a *ſcripture-expreſſion*, and often uſed to thoſe who were not very *good kings*; and *ſignifies* no more than *let the king live*, as the *Hebrew* reads it; which *Daniel* uſed to an *heathen* king, who had caſt him into the *den* of *lions*, Dan. vi. 21.

But his *royal highneſs* had occaſions, while he was there, to be convinced of this; for he himſelf offered *pardon* to ſome of theſe *rebel-zealots*, who were *condemned* during his *adminiſtration*, upon the ſole condition of ſaying *God ſave the king*; but all his *rhetorick* could not perſuade them!

They have *ſhot* at and *wounded biſhops* in their *coaches* in the *ſtreets* of *Edinburgh*; they *aſſaſſinated* the lord arch-biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s, as before is mentioned; and preſently after flew out in open *rebellion*, and *fought* it in the *field* at *Bothwell-Bridge*, where theſe *aſſaſſinators* were their chief *commanders*; ſome of whom that eſcaped fled into *Holland*, and were followed by Sir

William Sharp, son to the arch-bishop, who applied himself to his *highness* for leave to *apprehend* them, but could not obtain it; and had the *mortification* to see them come over in his *train*, and employed in our *deliverance!* but without *confession* or *satisfaction* made for the *murder* of a *bishop*. No, they thought it no *murder*, but an *heroical* imitation of the *zeal* of *Phinehas!*

These were not content to use their *slovenly* way of *worship*, in their own *houses*, or in reasonable *companies*, which was not denied them; but they would meet on the *hills*, 5, 6, 7, or 8000 of them together, in arms, where they committed several *murders*.

And when the king did *indulge* about an *hundred* of their *preachers*, and gave them full *liberty* to *hear* them, in a *peaceable way*, they *spurned* at it, and would have none of it. And those of their own *preachers* who accepted of this *liberty* from the king, they *forsook* and *disdained* them, as the *king*'s, or the *councils curates*, which they, in *contempt*, called them; and would not meet otherwise than in opposition to the *government*, and in what *numbers* they pleased, and to do what they pleased! This occasioned the *laws* made against those *field-conventicles* of rebellion, which these *good men* call *persecution*.

And yet how many of them did the king spare! he shewed great *mercy* to them, for which they now call him *tyrant!* and have rebelled since over and over again.

The renowned Sir *George Mackenzie*, lord *advocate* in *Scotland*, wrote a *vindication* of the *reign* of K. *Char.* II. in *confutation* of these false *representations* of the *whigs*, printed here in *London* since the *revolution*; and it remains *unanswered* by them to this day, for they cannot, it is matter of fact, of which he had perfect knowledge, being then upon the place, and more particularly *obliged* by his *office* to take cognizance of it. Yet the old *objections* are here again *represented*, in *ample* form, by this *author* of the *account*, without the least *notice*, that they have been all already *confuted!* and he knows it full well.

Can

Can this author find in all that *reign* any who were *Glencoed* under *trust*, after they had laid down their *arms*, and submitted to the *government*?

Can he find such an instance of the *breach* of *publick faith*, as we are told of in *The Flying Post*, Mar. 30, 1704? That the *privy-council* of *Scotland* (the major part of which he confesses to be *presbyterians*) having given Sir *Alexander Macdonald* of *Glengary* (a relation of *Mac-Donald* of *Glencoe*, and who quit his *house* for fear of the like treatment, under the same *presbyterian* administration) their *safe conduct* to come to *Edinburgh* by such a day, and for 15 days after that he might be secure of his safe return, did, when he came accordingly, commit him *close prisoner*, and when he pleaded the *safe conduct* they had given him, they *despised* it, and committed him *notwithstanding!*

This is *John Hus* and the *council* of *Constance*; the *presbyterian* out-doing the *jesuit*; for the *council* broke only the *emperor*'s *safe conduct*, but these break *their own*. Though acting in her *majesty*'s name, they are liable to her just resentment, that her *honour* suffer not in the case. This is giving no *quarter*, and making men *desperate*; it *prostitutes* the *dignity* of *government*, and *dissolves* all *faith* and *trust* not only betwixt *prince* and *people*, but among all *mankind*; and transforms us all into so many *beasts* of *prey*, independent on *society* or *laws*, shewing no man any *security* but in the *strength* of his own *arm*; it turns us from *Christians* far below the *heathen!*

If the *Flying Post* has *mis-represented*, let him look to that.

Otherwise these *reflections* are *just*; and these *presbyterians* the *abhorring* of all *flesh!*

Many have *broke* their *faith*; but none except they do it *above-board*, and stand in it! This is not the first time, their *history* affords plentiful *examples*; and must they be *trusted* still!

There are particular *persons* among them, some of which I know, men of *honour* and *good nature*, whom I could *trust* with any thing of *private* concern. But

take them as a *body*, they are, and ever have been, the most *false* and *perfidious* that can be shewed of *human* race! And the question is not, Where they have *broke* their *faith?* but where they ever *kept* it, in any thing wherein their *cause* was concerned? or ever gave a true *representation* of *themselves*, or of their *adversaries?* or would *disown* a *lye* they once *told*, though never so plainly *confuted?* or *ceased* to *repeat* it over again, tho' they could not *answer* what was said against it?

For it is not the *method* of that *party* to *answer*, but to *repeat* and *repeat* their *lyes* still on, without a *blush!* and to *hammer* them into *people* by mere *dint* of *diligence!* And how *strangely* have they *prevailed!*

Thus that notorious *lye* in their *claim of right* of their *having reformed from popery by presbyters*, as well as that *prelacy* was *an unsupportable grievance and trouble to that nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the reformation* having been *effectually* and *demonstratively* disproved from their own *histories*, in the *fundamental charter of presbytery*, printed at *London* for *Char. Brome* in the year 1695; yet this *author* takes no *notice* of it, but *insists* still upon what he knows to be a *lye!*

But what need he give *himself* the *lye!* and in the same *breath*, that no body can *miss* it! He pretends (to shew the great *moderation* of the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*) that the *prelatists* there enjoy not only *toleration*, but a *comprehension* too; and yet he tells, p. 42. that any sort of *toleration* was not only *refused* to them, as being the *establishing of iniquity by a law*; but p. 46. that an *act* passed making it *high-treason*, by word, deed, or writing, to defend *episcopacy*, or impugn *presbytery*; and upon this, says he *(insultingly!) The toleration act was dropped, and no more heard of it.* It was time indeed, when it was made *high-treason* to propose it!

And for the *comprehension* (though it is foolish to talk of that, where a *toleration* is denied) there is an *act* set down, p. 120. made *June* 12, 1693. wherein the condition of the *comprehension* is, That *they take the oath of allegi-*

allegiance and assurance, subscribe the confession of faith, and declare the same to be the confession of their own faith, and own the doctrines therein contained to be true, and that they will constantly adhere to the same; and likewise that they own and acknowledge presbyterian *church government to be the only government of this church; and will submit thereto, and concur therewith; and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion thereof; and that they likewise subscribe to observe the present uniformity of worship,* &c. And says, p. 122. *This was the first act of* comprehension *obtained for the episcopal clergy.* Is that man *besides himself,* to call this a *comprehension,* which *excludes* all but rank *presbyterians!* it is as severe a *test* as could be worded against the *episcopal clergy.*

Well then, he gives us another in the year 1695, which he puts foremost, for the better *grace,* because it bears more *shew* of *favour,* it begins at p. 79. and requires only the *oath* of *allegiance and assurance.* But who were *included* in this? they only, *that were, at the time of his majesty's happy accession to the crown, and have since continued actual ministers in particular parishes; and no sentence, either of deposition or deprivation past against them.*

First, hereby are *excluded* all the *episcopal clergy,* who, at the beginning of the *revolution,* were *rabbled,* in *savage* manner, and thrust out of their *parishes,* (and some of them out of their *lives)* by the godly *mob,* set on work by the *ring-leaders* of the *faction,* not only without *law,* but against all the *laws* then in being, before the *prince* of *Orange* had *accession* to the *crown* of *Scotland;* but after his coming over, in order to it! And their *convention* did adjudge all the *clergy* thus turned out, by the *mob,* to have been lawfully *ousted,* and that none of them should be *restored.* All these are *excluded* out of this *gracious act.*

Secondly, all that had been turned out by the *presbyterian* administration, from the beginning of the *revolution,* to *July* 16, 1695, the date of that *act.* In which

time, they, having the *full* and absolute *power*, had made what *purgations* they pleased, and could effect, all over the *nation*; so that we may suppose there were few episcopal clergy left in *possession*, except in the *north*, and some other places, where the *people* kept them in, by strong hand, and defended them from the *presbyterian inquisition*, following their own *inclinations*, as they said, since that was the *rule*, and the reason given in the *claim of right* for abolishing of *episcopacy!* And these stood out upon account of the *oaths*, as well as of *episcopacy*; so that this act was no *favour* to these, except to *tempt* them by *fair means*, whom they could not otherwise bring to *compliance*. And we must think that very *few*, if *any*, of those in their *power*, were left in *possession* in 1695, seeing this *author* tells us, p. 82. that *about* 315 *were turned out in* 1689, *and* 1690.

And it seems they did not expect *many* to come in, when no longer time was given by this *act*, than from *July* 16, the day it was made, to *Sept.* 1. next following, in which time many of the kingdom might not hear of it. And if any did come in, they were expressly barred from being *members* of their *general assemblies*, *synods*, or *presbyteries*, from *licensing*, *ordaining*, *or any part of government* in the *church*, unless they were *assumed* by their *kirk-judicatories*, who were left free to *assume* them or not, as they pleased, notwithstanding their having taken the *oaths*.

But there is a latitude given, even after the said first of *September*, that if any be *assumed* by the *kirk-judicatories*, upon their *certificate*, such *shall be admitted and allowed to qualify himself by taking the oath of allegiance, and subscribing the same with the assurance*; that is, in *English*, if the *kirk* be satisfied of their being thorough *presbyterians*, and for their turn, they are then, and not till then, rightly *qualified* to take the *oaths* to K. *William!* But where is the *comprehension* here? for all is still left in the hands of the *kirk*; and they are not required to *assume* any but whom they think fit. The *security* here proposed is the *proverb* of *giving the wolf the lamb to keep*. The

bishops in *Scotland* had power to *assume* such of the *presbyterians* as they thought fit. Were the *presbyterians* thankful for this *grace?* Did they think it a *comprehension?*

But in this *act* there is a *clause*, *That such of the said ministers as shall not come in betwixt and the said day, are hereby, and by force of this present act*, ipso facto, *deprived of their respective kirks and stipends, and the same declared vacant, without any further sentence.* This opens the *mystery* of this gracious *act!* which was to *oust* those *episcopal clergy* in the *north*, by force of an act of *parliament*, whom all the *kirk-authority* could not *dispossess*, they being supported by the *inclinations* of the *people*. And this is the reason that the *time* allowed them was so *short*, wherein probably *few* or *none* of them could take the benefit of the act, if they had a mind to it; for the *kirk* was resolved to get rid of them, at any rate, they were *thorns* in their *sides*, and their *stout opposition* did much *abate* the *authority* of the *kirk* all over the *kingdom*.

But hereby they are fallen into a worse *snare!* for by this, *lay-deprivation* is allowed, and the *civil government* intermeddling to the full, not only *circa sacra*, but *in sacris*, as this *author* does distinguish, p. 74. and gives it as the great *reason* of the *non-conformity* of the *presbyterians* to the *episcopal* government, because of the *erastianism* they said of the *bishops* in submitting to the *encroachments* of the *civil* power upon the *inherent rights* of the *church*, such as this *author* there mentions, *to be judges of the qualifications and doctrine of ministers, or terms of church-communion*; which, he says, the *presbyterians* (not in *Holland*, but) in *Scotland*, have *always opposed*. Yet now they fly to it, when it will serve their *turn!*

If they say, the *kirk* could not help it, it was the *parliament* that did it.

Answ. It was a *parliament* they *commend*, and bring this as a *proof* of the great *moderation* of the *kirk*; how else does it shew the *moderation* of the kirk, if the kirk did not *consent* to it?

And, *2dly*, Might they not suppose this to be the case with the *church* too; and that she ought not to be loaded with all the acts of *parliament* made in such cases?

But he brings a very substantial *argument* against *admitting* any, whom they knew to be *well-affected* towards *episcopacy*, whatever *tests* they took, or however they *qualified* themselves, which is, p. 102. that they could not *give any manner of assurance, that they would not endeavour to subvert the constitution of the church, if they were admitted into the share of her government*. This I own to be *unanswerable*, it is strong *sense* and *reason*; and supposing that they thought themselves in the right, they ought not to have *admitted* any such. But then their *hypocrisy* lies in this, 1, To *pretend* otherwise, and *produce* sham *acts* of *parliament* which mean no such thing, but the direct *contrary*. And 2*dly*, That they will not allow others to make use of the same *prudence* and *caution*, but plead *birth-rights*, and such like *senseless* things against them; and call that *persecution* in *others*, which they *justify* in *themselves*.

The address of the general assembly in *Scotland* to her majesty.

This *author* has presented us, in his *paper* of *March* 25, 1704, with the address of the *general assembly* of the kirk in *Scotland* to her *majesty*, sent the same *month*.

1. It begins with that fully disproved *lye*, of the *reformation* in *Scotland* being by *presbyters*, and that the *presbyterian government was at that time settled*. Of this before.

2. As *false* is it what they next say of *God having always signally blessed the presbyterian government of that church, and the discipline thereof, for the suppressing of prophanity and curbing of error*.

This is well said, if it did not want the *circumstance* of *truth*; for they stand chargeable not only with their *schism*, in breaking off from the *church government* of the whole earth, from the days of the *apostles* to *John Calvin*; but likewise their doctrine is charged as *corrupt* and *unsound* in the *faith*, and tending, by a natural consequence, to *profanity* and *error*.

Such are their *anti-nomian* doctrines (the presbyterians in *Scotland* are generally *anti-nomians*) that *God* sees no

sin

sin in his *elect*; that the *good* actions of the *reprobate* are *hateful* to *God*; and the *sins* of the *elect* not *displeasing* to him. They explain *election* and *reprobation* at such a rate, as to render those whom they call the elect, *secure* in their *sins*, though never so *heinous*, and continued in to their last *breath*; they *save* them by *hidden* and *irreversible* decrees, without any consideration of their *good* or *bad* lives; they make *God* the author of *sin*, by denying *free-will* in *man*, and saying that all our actions are *predetermined*, and we cannot *mend* them.

This is not only *mentioned*, but *insisted* upon in the 2d *part* of *New Association*, p. 18, *&c.* but no *answer* given to it in the *Occasional Letter* before considered.

From such *principles* as these it is not strange to find such an abounding of *immorality and prophaneness* as this kirk-address does acknowledge to be now among them; it makes the *gentry deists*, and the *common people enthusiasts*.

They may say, as an *anti-nomian preacher* in *London* did, not long since, to a friend who asked him the *success* of his *ministry*; he answered with great *commotion*, and seemed to *wonder, that he had preached a congregation of Christians into a congregation of devils*.

That *prophaneness and immoralities* (some of a *sort* not known before) have *abounded* in *Scotland*, much more since the late *establishment of presbytery* there, is *notorious* to all in that *country*, and *bewailed* by the *good men* of the *general assembly*, who cannot find a *reason* for it!

To what is before said, let me add the *prophaneness* of their *holy things*; their *slovenly* way of *worship*, sitting upon their *tails*, and their *hats* on their *heads* or *hanging* upon one *ear*. And having banished as well *decency* as *learning* with the *episcopal clergy*, their *lean-flashy-tedious sermons*, and telling *God* all the *news* of the *town* in their *prayers*, their *Scots-presbyterian eloquence*, and *nasty-kitchin-metaphors* applied to the *Almighty*, are indeed *blasphemous*, (which they call *familiarity* with *God*) and cannot go down with any man of *sense*, or who has a due notion of the *Infinite Majesty*. This *deformity* of *holiness*

has

has rendered their *religion* nauseous, especially among the young *nobility* and *gentry*, and inclined them to *atheism* or *popery*; of the *increase* of which the *general assembly* does likewise complain. And when the comparison lies betwixt the *pompous superstition* of the one, and the *mechanick dullness* and *irreverence* of the other, it is not to be wondered, that *popery* as well as *prophaneness* and *immorality*, has had so many *proselytes* among the *presbyterians*.

But the *presbyterians* give another reason for it, *viz.* that the *devil* is always most busy among the *saints*; whence arise those swarms of *witches* (all *dissenters*) which rise and fall with *presbytery*, and its *off-spring*; hardly heard of under *episcopal administration*.

Besides the *debauchees* of the *covenant* are excused upon another *account*, as one of their *ministers* since the *revolution*, said of a certain *patron* of theirs, who was *wicked* out of the *common road*, and *notoriously* so; we must not take notice of him, for *scandal* to the *cause*; and *he is as good to God another way*. He was *sound* at *heart*; for he had built them a *synagogue*.

I wish the *general assembly* had named some of those *blessings* which they observe have always *signally* attended *presbyterian government* in *Scotland*. I have heard, that as *rebellion* introduced it, so the *sword*, *famine*, *sickness*, and *poverty* have always attended its *establishment*. All which have *signally* followed it now. They have not been established before since *forty-one*, those *blessed* times! Is this the *blessing* of which they now mind her *majesty*? the *rebellion* they then raised against her royal *grandfather*, which *succeeded* (though he had *established* them too) till it brought on his *destruction*, and of the *church* with him, not only in *Scotland*, but in *England* and *Ireland*! and all this, by his *playing* with them, his *courting* and *caressing* them, till they grew too *strong* for him; and they made as *fine loyal addresses* as they do now; nay more, they once declared themselves fully satisfied, and that they had no more to *ask*, after his having *established* their *presbytery*, and abolished *episcopacy* for

for them. It was then a *contented people* and a *contented king*.

3. But it seems this *general assembly* will not be content with all this; they will not have any of the *episcopal clergy* left among them; they will not suffer them to *preach*, though in *vacant churches*, as the *address* speaks; nor to *baptize* their own *children*, or those of their *communion* in private *houses*, when the *church-doors* are shut against them, which this *address* calls *irregular baptisms*. For this they outraged Mr. *Massie*, &c. as before is told. They count it likewise *irregular* to *baptize* the *children* of any who are under *scandal* with them (and we know what they count *scandal*) thus punishing the innocent *child* for the *parent*'s offence. But they think the want of *baptism* to be little *harm*; they make it but a *formality!* and down it goes in their next *heat* against *set-forms!* they had almost worn it quite out, and the *Lord's supper* too, in their last *establishment*, as has been often told. See *Wolf Stript*, chap. iv. n. 3. p. 20.

If no *private baptisms* must be allowed in *Scotland*, and of no *children* of those who are under *scandal* by the *kirk*, then none of the *church* there can have their *children* baptized, unless at the peril of the *mob*, where the *presbyterians* prevail, as in the case of Mr. *Massie*, &c. or of the *royal* authority, which, as in the last *reign*, they bring in to their aid, where the *inclinations* of the *people* are episcopal, which is far the greater part of the *kingdom*. Therefore this *address* of the *general assembly* does direct her *majesty* to issue her *proclamation* against these episcopal clergy, who *preach* or *baptize*, and will not own the *sentences* of *deposition* by the *kirk-judicatories*, or of *deprivation* by the *privy-council*. These are the men who cry out upon *erastianism!* of which before. But now we have it as the proper *act* of the whole *general assembly*.

And they being now strengthened by a *letter* countersigned by D. of Q. to the *privy-council* there, in pursuance to their address, to let the *laws* loose against the dissenting *clergy* (so the *church* of *Scotland* is now named)

We

we may expect to hear more of their *sufferings*, till they are extirpated, if a more than ordinary *providence* does not interpose.

It is told in *New Assoc.* Par. II. Suppl. 14, 15. how Mr. *Rob. Calder*, an episcopal clergyman, was treated at *Aberdeen*, for *administering* the *holy sacrament* there *Easter* was twelve-months, 1703.

And this year, some of the episcopal clergy there having given notice for the *sacrament* to be administered in their own *meeting-houses* last *Easter-Day*, 1704, the *presbyterians* there, being much fewer in number than the *church*, durst not venture upon their common refuge the *mob*, but took hold of the advantage of the *letter* before mentioned, in her *majesty*'s name, and obtained a peremptory *summons* from the presbyterian *privy-council* there, for these *clergymen* to appear at *Edinburgh*, to answer these *irregular* proceedings. So that now they are deprived both of *baptism* and the *Lord*'s *supper*, and can have them no otherwise than in an *heathen country*, and as the primitive *church*, in times of *persecution*, under peril of the lawless *mob*, or of *authority*.

In this great distress, they of the *church* in *Aberdeen*, much superior in *number* and *substance* to the kirk *party*, have humbly *addressed* to her *majesty*, representing the deplorableness of their condition, and imploring her *majesty*'s protection, at least, for their *consciences*——— But they must bear their *chains*—And yet they rest fully assured of her majesty's good *inclinations* towards them, and doubt not in the least of the *sincerity* of her *majesty*'s professions when she came to the *throne*, of her being truly *episcopal*, as she had been educated. But they pity the *necessity* she is brought under by the *mis-representations* which have been made to her of the state and strength of the *faction*, in that kingdom, as well as in *England*. And they *pray* it may not prove to her *detriment*, as it did to her royal *grandfather*, who was thus persuaded, by the *artifice* of *designing men*, to his own *destruction*, and of the *church* and *nation* with him.

They

They *pray* for her *majesty*, and commit their *cause* to *God*.

Alas! poor *church* of *Scotland!* Alas for *episcopacy* in these kingdoms! which is no more of *divine right* in *England* than in *Scotland*. There is but one *episcopate* in the whole earth, of which each *church* is a *part*. And they used to be concerned for each other, as *members* of the same *body*. But by *our* unconcernedness now for the *church* of *Scotland!* by the experience of the last *age*, and the current of this, we may *compute*, that if episcopacy be not *restored* in *Scotland*, it will be *abolished* in *England*——as before. The *faction* in *Scotland* have *declared* it, and in *England* they will not *deny* it; and who is there to *hinder* it!

I would ask any moderate good-natured *dissenter* in *England* (for such I know there are) whether they would not think it *persecution*, and a design of utter *extirpation*, if they were prohibited from having their children *baptized* in their own *communion?* And after being *rabbled* for this, instead of *redress* or *protection*, should be answered, let the *laws* loose upon them; and if the *bishops*, if the *convocation* should be the *promoters* of this, and *address* for it, whether they would not be called *high-fliers*, of a *persecuting spirit*, &c?

And even this would not be so severe upon the *dissenters* here, as the hindering of *episcopal baptism* is upon the *church* in *Scotland*; because the *presbyterians* here do acknowledge, as well as in *Scotland*, the *validity* of *episcopal ordination* (from which their first reforming *presbyters* did derive their *mission* and *authority*) and consequently of their *baptisms*. Whereas the *presbyterian ordinations* are denied by us, and consequently their *baptisms* to be *valid*, more than if administered by a mere *layman*, or *woman*, in case of *necessity*. Nay, it is worse, for here mere *laymen* (for such are their *presbyters*, if their *ordination* is not *valid*) take upon them, not only in one single case of *necessity* (as *Uzzah* thought) but *ordinarily* and of *right* to *invade* the *sacred office*, in all its parts, and that in direct *opposition* to the *priesthood* ordained by *God*, like

like *Korah*; and so make it a stated *schism*. Therefore, though they may with a good *conscience*, and pursuant to their own *principles*, come to our *baptisms*, yet we cannot go to *theirs*. And therefore, if all *presbyterian baptisms* were forbid in *England*, it could not be such an oppression in *conscience* upon them, as the forbidding of *episcopal baptisms* in *Scotland* is to the *church* there.

And suppose we should turn upon them the argument made use of in the *representation* of the *commission of the general assembly* to the *parliament* in *Scotland* (inserted in *Wolf Stript*, Appen. *Num.* I. p. 2.) against any *toleration* to the *church* there, which they call *establishing iniquity by a law*, and give this reason, *That there can be no just ground to desire or grant such a toleration, seeing there was never in any nation a toleration allowed, where there was no pretence of conscience against joint-communion.* As to the *impudence* of their assertion, it is like *themselves!* to *out-face* the *sun* at *noon-day!* Are not our *objections* against their *ordinations*, and the *corruption* of their *doctrines*, in many particulars, besides those before-mentioned, so much as a *pretence* of *conscience* against their *communion!*

But what *pretence* of *conscience* had they against our *communion* since the *restoration*, 1660, in *Scotland?* where all the present *pretences* of the *English dissenters* were taken out of the way, to *try* to *please* them! there was no *liturgy*, nor any of our *ceremonies*; and they could not object against our *doctrine*. Let them shew any *pretence* but that of *episcopacy*; and it was *moderate* enough God knows! it was little more than their own *moderatorships*, except the *episcopal ordinations*, to keep up the *frame* of the *church*, and which they themselves dare not say are *invalid*, because it would destroy their own *reformation*, as they call it; and therefore they might have *complied* even with that *episcopacy* too, upon point of *conscience*. And so they had no *pretence* whatsoever against *joint-communion*; which argument they now as *falsly* as *foolishly* would turn upon the *church*.

But

But it quite *destroys* all the *pretences* of their *brethren* in *England*, even to a *toleration* here! yet they are *brethren* still, for they are against *episcopacy*; and so are the *presbyterians* in *Holland*, for the same reason, though their grand enemy *erastianism* reigns there, more than in any part of the world; yet they dare object it against the *church* of *England!* and practise it themselves (as before is shewed) when it will serve their cause. They can join with *Erastus*, or the very *French papists* (whom they invited over in *forty-one*) against the common foe *episcopacy*; with which they are now making *root and branch work*, when they will not suffer them to *baptize* their *children*. It is like the *Ægyptian* tyranny, commanding us to throw out our *children* (not excepting the *females*) that they may not *live*. The one respected only *bodily* life, but this concerns their *souls*.

And though we know that the *presbyterians* lay very little stress upon *baptism*, and will let their own *children* die without it, rather than *baptize* them *privately*, or not upon one of their *preaching-days*, as is common in *Scotland*; yet is it not a terrible *imposition* upon their *consciences*, who think otherwise, that the *presbyterians* will neither *baptize* their *children* themselves, if sent for to their houses, upon never so apparent danger of *death*, nor suffer any *others* to do it!

Yet Mr. *Ridpath* would make us believe, that the *episcopal clergy* in *Scotland* enjoy not only a *toleration*, but a *comprehension* too! and that there is no *oppressing* of *tender consciences* there! Would the *dissenters* be content with such a *comprehension* in *England?*

The *acts of uniformity*, 1 *Eliz.* & 14 *Car.* II. yet *unrepealed*, inflict severe *penalties* upon any who, by *word* or *writing*, shall *declare or speak any thing to the derogation, depraving, or despising of the book of Common-Prayer*; yet it is pelted every day, from *press* and *pulpit*, in *coffee-houses*, and both *publick* and *private conversation*. Would the *dissenters* take it well, if the *convocation* should address her *majesty* to issue her *royal proclamation*, and command her *judges* and all *officers*, to see those *laws* put in due

due *execution*, and ſhould give this as an *anſwer* to Mr. *Calamy*, and the reſt of their *writers?* as the *general aſſembly* has done in *Scotland*, in *anſwer* to the *Cyprianick age*, and other *confutations* of their *ſchiſm*, wrote by the *epiſcopal clergy* there; but have now ſtopt their mouths by an *act* making it high treaſon to *ſpeak* or *write* in defence of *epiſcopacy*, or againſt their *preſbytery*; and other *anſwer* give they none. And the *diſſenters* here cry up their *moderation!*

Lord, how long wilt thou look upon this?

NUMB. III.

The lord chancellor Puckering *his* ſpeech, *delivered in the* houſe *of* lords, *in the year* 1588, *taken out of the* State Worthies, *2d Edit.* 1679, p. 607, 608.

" YOU are eſpecially commanded by her majeſty " to take heed, that no ear be given, nor time " afforded to the wearisome ſolicitations of thoſe that " commonly be called *puritans*, wherewithal the late " *parliaments* have been exceedingly importuned; which " ſort of men, whilſt that (in the giddineſs of their ſpi- " rits) they labour and ſtrive to advance a *new elder-* " *ſhip*, they do nothing elſe but diſturb the good repoſe " of the church and commonwealth; which is as well " grounded for the body of *religion* it ſelf, and as well " guided for the *diſcipline*, as any realm that confeſſeth " the truth. And the ſame is already made good to " the world by many of the writings of godly and " learned men, neither anſwered, nor anſwerable by " any of theſe new-fangled refiners. And, as the caſe " ſtandeth, it may be doubted, whether they or the " *jeſuits* do offer more danger, or be more ſpeedily to " be repreſſed; for albeit the *jeſuits* do empoiſon the " hearts

" hearts of her *majesty*'s subjects, under a pretext of
" conscience, to withdraw them from their obedience due
" to her majesty, yet they do the same but closely, and
" in privy corners: but these men do both teach and
" publish in their printed books, and teach in all their
" *conventicles*, sundry opinions, not only dangerous to
" a well-settled estate, and the policy of the realm, by
" putting a pique between the *clergy* and the *laity*, but
" also much derogatory to her sacred *majesty*, and her
" *crown*, as well by the diminution of her antient and
" lawful *revenues*, and by denying her highness's prero-
" gative and supremacy, as by offering *peril* to her *ma-*
" *jesty*'s safety in her own kingdom. In all which things,
" (however in other points they pretend to be at war
" with the popish *jesuits*) yet by the separation of them-
" selves from the unity of their fellow subjects, and by
" abasing the sacred *authority* and *majesty* of their *prince*,
" they do both join and concur with the *jesuits* in open-
" ing the door, and preparing the way to the *Spanish*
" *invasion* that is threatened against the realm, *&c.*

Observations upon this SPEECH.

1. It is not so strange, that the *puritans*, in 1588, should be instrumental in the *Spanish invasion* against a *queen* who kept a *severe* but *just* hand over them; as that the *presbyterians* in 1641, should invite the *French* over hither against a *king*, who had so wonderfully exceeded in his favours to them.

And their *treason* was detected, and their *letters* taken which they wrote to the *French king*; who, being then in his *minority*, and his *affairs* embroiled, by a *rebellion* against him in his own country, could not assist them with an *armada*; but his chief *ministers*, first *cardinal Richelieu*, and after *Mazareen* did help them to form and carry on their *rebellion* from first to last; and pretended to vindicate themselves herein by way of retaliation, for K. *Char.* I. having sent an army to assist those who were in *rebellion* against the *French king* at *Rochelle*.

Let

Heath's Chron. ad ann. 1653, p. 343.

Let me here obſerve how differently *Oliver* did act the *king*, in the beginning of his *reign*, who *rejected* the firſt *foreign addreſs* that was made to him by the *city* of *Bourdeaux* then in *rebellion* againſt the *French king*, and ſaid, *That ſuch examples were no way to be encouraged by him.* So far he had a true notion of *royalty*, that if *kings* would not aſſiſt each other's *rebels*, but rather join together againſt them, it would keep all *kings* more *ſecure*, and make *rebellion* any where *impracticable*. And though they may ſerve a preſent turn by it, in time of *war* or other *exigence*, it never fails to come home to them, at one time or other.

Cardinal *Richelieu* was more than revenged for *Rochelle*, by the aſſiſtance and direction he gave to the *Scots preſbyterians*, and ſent them a more powerful and wicked *engine* than the *Spaniſh armada*, their curſed *ſolemn league and covenant*, which, *mutatis mutandis*, is word for word the very ſame with that called *the holy league*, which, under the name of preſerving *religion* had raiſed that terrible *rebellion* in *France*, which almoſt ruined the whole *nation*. And as that *holy league*, which was worded to be *for the preſervation of the king's majeſty's perſon and authority, in the preſervation and defence of the Roman catholick religion*, did *murder* their K. *Hen.* III. who lived and died a zealous *Roman catholick:* ſo our *ſolemn league* which was worded in the ſame manner, in defence of the king and the *proteſtant religion*, did *murder* K. *Char.* I. who lived and died a moſt zealous *proteſtant*.

And as the firſt *puritans* in the reign of Q. *Eliz.* were the ſpawn of the *jeſuits* and *popiſh emiſſaries*, ſuch as *Heath*, *Cummin*, &c. who broached among us the *enthuſiaſtical* notions of being ſent forth to *preach* by the *impulſes* of our own *ſpirits*, without any outward *ordination* by *man*, and run down *liturgies* as a *dead* form, and ſet up, in oppoſition to them, the *extempore babble* (as it was in moſt of them) for the more *ſpiritual* way; and this on purpoſe to divide and diſtract the *church* of *England*, as was evidently proved before the *queen* and *coun-*

cil

cil by their *letters of miſſion* taken with them, and even their own *confeſſion*, when palpably *detected* and brought to *juſtice*: ſo have they run on in the ſame way, from that day to this, and have been acted by *popiſh councils* and *meaſures*, (though all of them knew it not) as to bring in the *Spaniſh invaſion* in that *reign*; ſo afterwards the *French* deſigns, to the ruin of our *church*, and of our *monarchy*.

2. We may obſerve from this *ſpeech*, how troubleſome they have always been to *parliaments*, importuning and ſoliciting them without end. And that it was the opinion of this wiſe *queen*, that no *ear* was to be given, nor *time* afforded them; for ſhe ſaw the fatal *conſequences* we have ſince *experienced!*

3. That though their *pretences* were fully *anſwered* by the then learned *divines*, and ſo *confuted* that they could make no *reply*; yet that they ſtill *clamoured* as much as ever, *re-printed* their *objections* in new *books*, with which they filled the *nation*, and carried it on in their *conventicles*, with undaunted *aſſurance!*

4. That one of their main *engines* was, to blacken the *clergy* to the *laity*, and as it is worded in the *ſpeech*, to make a *pique* between them.

5. That as their *doctrine* was *anti-monarchical*, ſo danger was apprehended to the *queen*'s perſon from them.

I pray *God* our preſent *queen* may not ſtand in *hiſtory*, one *inſtance* more of *preſbyterian gratitude*, after her royal *father* and *grandfather*. Let her rather *triumph* over them, as Q. *Elizabeth* did, and K. *Char*. II. after the *Oxford parliament*.

When ſhe takes the ſame *method* with them, ſhe will have the like *ſucceſs*.

She has ſeen *both* methods *tried* before her, and the *iſſue* of *both* more than *once*; even as often as *either* of them has been *tried*.

O! let me not in this too prove a Caſſandra.

NUMB.

NUMB. IV.

Geneva, April 15, 1704, N. S.

I Remember I told in ſome of my former, of one Mr. *Oſterwald*, a *miniſter* of *Neufchattel*, who has eſtabliſhed in the *churches* belonging to that *principality*, a *ſet form of prayer*, in imitation of the *Engliſh liturgy*; he has engaged them to obſerve the chief *feſtivals* of the *Chriſtian* religion, and endeavours all he can to bring them to a near conformity with the *church* of *England*, being convinced that it is the moſt conformable in all reſpects to the *antient primitive church*. I believe in proceſs of time the holy city of *Geneva* will be in ſome nearer degree of proximity to us than it has been hitherto, and that by the means of three or four of their *miniſters*, who are men of piety and learning, and free from prejudice. They propoſed not long ago to reform ſome of the weekly *ſermons*, and inſtead of them to eſtabliſh a *ſet form of prayer*, intermixed with *pſalms*, and reading of the *ſcriptures*. This propoſal met with oppoſition from a great many of the old and moſt bigotted *miniſters*, who repreſented that ſuch innovations were dangerous, and that this was a laid deſign to introduce the *Engliſh liturgy* among them. The *magiſtrates* hearing of this diviſion among the *miniſters*, gave orders that three *miniſters* might be deputed from each *party*, to inform them fully of the ſtate of the *debate*; and accordingly the *miniſters* pleaded their cauſe ſolemnly before the *council*. Above two *thirds* of the *magiſtrates* were for the *alteration*, to have many of the *ſermons* aboliſhed, and a *ſet form of prayer* eſtabliſhed in their place; but they were unwilling to make this change without the unanimous conſent of all *parties*, and they deputed ſix of their number to have a conference with thoſe who oppoſed the change, and to convince them of the reaſonableneſs of it, and that they had no deſign to bring in any innovation, but what might tend to the advance-

ment

ment of religion. They have at last agreed the matter, to retrench some *sermons*, but not so many as was intended, and to establish a short *form of prayer*, which the *ministers* are now preparing.

For *application* of this *letter*, I refer to *Wolf Stript*, p. 49, 50.

NUMB. V.

Edinburgh, April 5, 1704.

THE 15th day of *March* last, being *Wednesday*, the weekly *mercate* at *Edinburgh*, there was a *procession* brought from the *low council-house*, by the way of the *Talbooth*, and in view of the mercate people, and along the *lucken-booths* to the *cross*, by orders of her majesty's *privy-council*, which was our Blessed *Saviour*'s *picture* in *tallie-douce* upon the *cross*; this was carried upon the point of a *halbert* by a *town-officer*. The *hangman* and his *man* followed after, both arrayed in *priests-vestments*, with *crucifixes* upon their foreheads, and every one of the *officers* carried something: in this manner they came to the *cross*, where there was a *fire* prepared, into which they put our *Blessed Saviour*'s *picture*, the *priests vestments*, the *crucifixes*, together with some *consecrated wafers*, the *vulgar Latin bible*, and some other books, and *burnt* them all. They beat the sides of the *chalice* together, and having thrown it into the *fire*, they took it out again, pretending they would sell it and give it to the *poor*.

I have enquired further into this account from *Edinburgh*, it not being easy to be believed in a *Christian* country; and I have it from undoubted hands, and can now give it to the reader for a certain *truth*. And there were several other aggravating *circumstances*, which are not here set down. I desire to make the following *observations* upon this.

1. The *vulgar Latin translation* of the holy *bible*, though not so good as our *English translation*, in the *main*, is better in several *particulars*; however, it is as much the *bible* as *ours*. We all here, *dissenters* as well as others, appeal every day from our *English* to the *original*, in disputed *texts*. Must therefore our *English bible*, if any *error* or *mistake* is found in it, be *burnt!* Would not this be called *burning* the *holy scriptures* of *God!* As much is the other. There are various *lections* of the *originals*, as well as *translations*; must all be *burnt?* Then there may not be a *bible* left in the world!

2. Our dispute with the *church* of *Rome* concerning *transubstantiation*, relates to the *manner* of *Christ*'s *presence* in the *holy sacrament*.

But all *Christian churches* do retain the words of our *Blessed Saviour*, and own, that it is his *body and blood*, though they cannot, nor ought to presume to define the *manner*, because it is not *revealed*.

Now to take that which we own to be the *body* of *Christ*, in an *ineffable* manner, and to *burn* it by the hands of a *hangman!*——*horresco referens!*——

3. Though I think all *pictures* of *God* the *Father* to be utterly unlawful, as being most expressly forbidden in the *holy scriptures*, as well as against *sense* and *reason*; And though the *picture* of our *Blessed Saviour*, as a *man*, comes not under that *prohibition*, because he was really a *man*; yet I think such *pictures* of him do rather *depress* and *lessen* our notion, even of his *humanity*, which is not *adorable* but upon the account of his *hypostatical* union with the *divinity*, which cannot be *expressed* in a *picture*; and therefore I could wish, that there were not one such *picture* in the world: yet still, to *crucify* the *picture* of our *Saviour*, to thrust a *spear* into its *side* (where the top of the *halbert* went in, in this *procession*) and to *burn* it by a *hangman*, is most *abhorrent*, it is *executing* of him in *effigy*, and as great *contempt* of him as any *heathen* or *Jew* could shew. It would not be born among the *Mahometans*, they have a greater *veneration* for *Christ*. And such a *procession* in *Constantinople* would have been punished with *death*.

4. A

4. A *cross* is no *picture* or *resemblance* of any *person*, but a *proper* and *lively* calling to mind the *passion* of our *Blessed Saviour*; and, as such, was used in the *primitive church*. And *crosses* stand still upon the *churches* in *Geneva*; but the *Scots presbyterians* are the *abhorring of all flesh*.

The *test* in *Japan* for a *Christian*, is the trampling upon the *cross*. This is thought a sufficient indication, that he who does it is no *Christian*. By this the *Dutch* secure that *trade* to themselves; yet I fancy would *startle* at *burning* the *bible*, or the *holy sacrament*, by which they commonly *swear*; for none upon earth come up to the *Scots presbyterians!*

5. The *prophaning* of a *chalice*, or any thing *dedicated* to *holy uses*, is their proper *food*; they have lived upon it ever since their *reformation*; they know no such *sin* as *sacrilege*, except in taking a *rag* from their *covenant!*

6. Their rage against the *vestments* of a *popish priests*, was equally meant against those of the *church* of *England*; they call our *surplice* a *rag* of the *whore*, &c. and will burn them, and us too, by the hands of the *hangman*, whenever it is in their power. Are the *vestments* our quarrel with the *church* of *Rome?* The *vestments* of the *clergy* are *separated* for *holy* use; but the *persons* who are *dedicated* to *God* are more *sacred* than *things*. The *person* of *Aaron* was more *sacred* than the *temple*, as being a nearer *type* of *Christ*; and to have robbed *Aaron* of his *vestments*, or to have *prophaned* them, would have been greater *sacrilege*, than to have *prophaned* the *utensils* of the *temple*. And to dress an *hangman* in the *robes* of a *priest* of *God*, is such a *contempt* of *God* as would not have been born among the *heathen*. They have a greater regard for *religion* than a true *presbyterian!*

7. It is most astonishing, that all this should be done by the face of *authority*, by order of the *privy-council*, though *presbyterians*. That they should not have consulted their *honour*, at least, to act such a publick *despite* to *religion*, deliberately, and in cool blood, as must make the *ears* of all that *hear* it to *tingle*, and ren-

der them most *odious* and *detested* to the whole *Christian* world!

8. I know nothing in *history* equal to this, but what proceeded from the same *spirit*, which possessed the reforming *lords* and *commons* in *England*, in the year 1644; when forming their *directory*, which they set up in room of the *Common-Prayer*, it was under deliberation, whether they should retain in it the *Creed* and the *Ten Commandments?* which being put to the *question*, it was carried in the *negative*; and they were *rejected*, and are not in the *directory*. This you will see in the Lord *Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, Vol.* II. Book viii. p. 452, 453.

Thus we find, that it is not *England* or *Scotland*, which of them is the worst? But the *faction*, the *party*, the *devil* in either, who is now let loose again, in the same *shapes* in which he appeared formerly; and will go as far in the one *kingdom* as in the other, where he is not *resisted*.

The *Lord* rebuke him, and his cursed *agents*; and *deliver* us from them, *Amen*.

June 10, 1704.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

June 22, 1704.

THIS day I saw a letter, from *Edinburgh*, with this note of Mr. * *Webster*'s prayer, *last Sunday* (says the letter) *from an hearer*; his words were these, *We thank thee, O Lord, for supporting the cause of thy own people in our neighbour nation, by putting it in the hearts of the godly lords there, so stoutly to oppose the very wicked house of commons.*

* A great ring-leader in *Edinburgh*.

I thought the reader would forgive me to tell him this piece of news in a *Postscript*, the foregoing sheets being almost wrought off, that I could not insert it in its proper place; and I thought it worth the while, for these reasons;

To shew how the *whigs* and *dissenters* reckon themselves all one *body* in *England* and in *Scotland*; and concern themselves mutually for each other.

And should it not be so with the *church!*

To cure, if possible, that *fatal* and *sleepy notion* in too many here, that we are not concerned at what they do in *Scotland*; that the *dissenters* here and there are two sorts of *people*; and that they in *Scotland* have no design upon *England*; and that it is only their *impertinence* to meddle with our affairs *here*: no, it is their *business*, and they are truly in the right of it; for the *cause* of the *dissenters* can never *stand* in *Scotland*, unless it *prevail* in *England*; and their *party*, as their *principles*, are one and the same in both *kingdoms*; the chief *council* of whom, and the principal *managers* are *English whigs*, whose *cabal*

bal in *London* give out the *necessary orders* through the whole *body*, as well in *Scotland* as in *England*; as before in *forty-one*; in the *Rye-House conspiracy*; in *Monmouth*'s rebellion, *&c.*

They begin in *Scotland* what they intend to bring into *England*. This is a sure *Index*, as it was in the times of *forty-one*; thence came the *covenant*; and there began the first *uproars* and *tumults* against *episcopacy*, the *liturgy*, *ceremonies*, &c. which soon after *flowed* with a strong *tide* into *England*.

And now see what they have begun in *Scotland*, in far greater *tumults* than those (of *women* only at first) which they raised in the reign of K. *Char.* I. even of 700 *men* in *arms*, expressly renouncing queen *Anne*, and *declaring* that they will have none but a *presbyterian* to *reign* over them; and that their *covenant* for the *extirpation* of *episcopacy* must be brought again into *England*: yet no notice taken of this, by the dexterity of their *managers* here; at the same time that the nation is filled with the noise of a *Scotch-plot*, on the other side, the bottom of which is not yet found out; I hope it will in the *Scots-parliament*. But here is *treason* and *rebellion* acted in the face of the *sun* by the *presbyterians*, and no inquisition made after it, though it cannot be denied, and their *declarations* published in *print*. Yet none are *alarmed!* no *jealousies* or *fears* on that side! which makes good the *character* given of us, *That the* English *believe every thing they* hear, *but nothing that they* see.

Our *house* of *commons* is *insulted* by their *high-fliers* (they are all *high-fliers* there) openly in their *pulpits*, and called *very wicked*, because they are true to the *church*, and would not put the *power* of *destroying* her into the hands of the *dissenters*, though they allow them a full and free *toleration*; at the same time that they not only refuse any *toleration* to the *church* there, but have made it *high-treason* to *speak* or *write* in her defence; and deny her the *liberty* to administer either *baptism* or the *Lord*'s *supper* to those of her own *communnion*: and visibly design, and conceal not their intention, totally to *extirpate* her,

her, that ſhe may riſe no more; which they have now in this *reign* again *vowed*, with the engagement of *lives* and *fortune*, in the *declarations* of both their *provincial ſynods*, at *Edinburgh* and *Glaſgow*, which are *printed* in the *New Aſſociation*.

And the more *fiercely* they go on, the greater *moderation* we put on, and *paſſive-obedience!* if any ſpeak in behalf of *epiſcopacy* now in *Scotland*, he is *hanged* by *law*; and here, where the *law* ſtands yet for the *church*, ſuch an one is *ſtigmatized* and *branded* as an *high-churchman* and a *papiſt*. None muſt ſpeak of the *diſſenters*, but with profound *reſpect!* nor mention what they have formerly done, or are now a doing! The *houſe* of *commons*, and those *lords* who are for preſerving our preſent *laws*, the *corporation* and *teſt acts* (to keep the *diſſenters* out of *power*) are *Legioned*, and *Millioned*, and *Obſervator'd!* and made the *jeſt* even of *Scots-whigs!* Such a *ſcene* was never ſeen before, nor will be believed in after *ages!*

But they have a time coming in view, and they hope near at hand, when the *church* of *England*, and *Old England* ſhall be no more!

AVERTAT DEUS.

The following letter, though of an old date, I have inſerted to ſhew what ſort of *things* their *preachers* and *kirk-judicatories* are, to which all muſt now ſubmit.

SIR, 30 *March*, 1704.

" YEsterday *Baillie* dree'd his repentance according " to the order of *council*; but had a great deal " of respect shewed to him by the many salutations he " received, and even concern for him, by the tears of " many gentlewomen; as soon as he came off the *pil-* " *lory*, the great crowd of by-standers waving their " hats in the air, gave him three several *huzzah's*, and " accompanying him to the *Nether-bow*, where he was " delivered to three companies of the foot-guards, gave " him a fourth; being with much difficulty kept up " from throwing of stones at his new guard, who, at " the *Mutresy-hill*, delivered him to two troops of *dra-* " *goons*, who had orders to carry him to the castle of " *Blackness*. They say,

" When he was on the *pillory*, a country woman, " who had come into the mercate, asked her next neigh- " bour, why such an honest-like man (for he was in " good dress) stood in that scandalous place? was in- " formed of the cause, and then said, in the hearing of " several, that she minded to have seen a very honest " woman scourged, and put upon that place, and here- " after sent to the plantations, for averring she had seen " major * *Weir* lying with another man's " wife; who had that same day twelve- " month, at a stake, confessed that " and much worse. She made no ap- " plication, but the story being in every " body's mouth, I have written it to " prevent a vacancy.

" I waited on the brethren this morn- " ing; prayers said, rolls called, mi- " nutes of the last sederunt read, Mr. " *Stirling* presented a letter from Mr. *Brown*, minister " of *Glasgow*, to this purpose, as near as I can re- " member;

* The chief saint of the covenant. See his extraordinary history, entitled *Ravillac Redivivus*, printed for *Walter Kittleby* at the *Bishop's-head* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*.

" *Upon*

" *Upon* Sunday *last, Mr.* John Hepburn *preached and* " *baptized within four miles of this place; there was a* " *great confluence of people from the neighbouring parishes,* " *and he has appointed a meeting next Sabbath, within a* " *mile of this town, his design being to raise a* schism *in* " *this* kirk, *and I fear is set upon this way by the enemies* " *of Christ's kingdom, though it's like he is so blind as not* " *to see it. But I wish the reverend* assembly *would take* " *a speedy way to extinguish this flame, lest, as a fire* " *kindled in one corner of a city consumes the whole, it* " *may burn this poor church to ashes.*

" This being read, and heard with a great deal of " attention, and by some called a great letter; there " was an overture brought in for putting the church " discipline in execution against *Hepburn*, and one *Mac* " *Millan*, formerly deposed by the synod of *Galloway*.

" After this, they nominated and instructed their " commission, and it being proposed that seven ruling " elders, and fourteen ministers should be a *quorum*, it " was objected by Mr. *Foyers*, minister at *Stanhouse*, " fourten was a very improper number, there having " once been in this land so many *bishops*; upon which " grave and weighty consideration, the number was " augmented and made fifteen. This done, and some " petitions read, we adjourned till four of the clock, " to my great contentment; at which time we met, " and, after a good sturdy prayer, we fell to our *synod-* " *books*, and upon them had some very learned, and one " very odd remark.

" 1. The synod of *Argyle* ordered one of their *pres-* " *byteries* to separate a man from his wife, because he " was married by a husbandman in *Lochaber*, albeit " they had co-habited as man and wife several years.

" 2. The *synod* of *Murray* had ordered a married wo- " man, who judicially confessed *adultery*, to be pro- " ceeded against as a slanderer of her self, the pretend- " ed adulterer having by oath cleared himself. These two " cases were earnestly pressed by some to be very well " worth the consideration of the assembly. But that was " shifted.

" I will trouble you only with another.

" It was *remarked* by the *visitors* of the *synod-books* of " *Aberdeen*, that that *synod*, without any legal proofs of " his being guilty of the crimes laid to his charge, had " ordered the *presbytery* of *Garioch* and *Turref* to excom- " municate summarily *Ross* of *Rotmaes*.

" Mr. *Huy*, minister of *Birs*, said, that the reason " why the *synod* had proceeded against that person after " that method, was, because, he was a very debauched " and profligate man, it being most certain that he had " lain with five several women at one and the same time, " and that all the five proved with child; and to the " aforesaid *presbyteries* confessed their great sin with that " abominable man."

CON-

CONTENTS
TO
CASSANDRA.

I. SEveral authors reflected upon page 185
1. One not named ibid.
2. The abridgment of *Eusebius* p. 186
3. The *Preface* to it ibid.
II. Of charging books upon parties p. 187
Wherein of the *Observator* p. 188
III. Of the *Secret History* p. 202
Wherein of the murder of the arch-bishop of St. *Andrew*'s p. 212
IV. The character of an enthusiast p. 218
V. Conclusion upon the bill of occasional conformity p. 220

APPENDIX.

I. A declaration of K. *Char.* II. in *Scotland*, 1650, with the act of the *West-kirk*, and general *Leslie*'s letter to *Oliver Cromwell* p. 223, &c.
Some observations upon this declaration p. 235
II. A letter concerning the present treatment the episcopal clergy in *Scotland* meet with from the presbyterians there p. 239

With ſome remarks upon a book lately printed, entitituled, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Scotland, *which met at* Edinburgh, May 6, 1703; and the late addreſs of the kirk to her majeſty p. 252

III. The lord chancellor *Puckering*'s ſpeech in the houſe of lords, anno 1588 p. 260

IV. A late letter from *Geneva*, of their nearer approaches to the church of *England* p. 264

V. The horrid proceſſion of the preſbyterians at *Edinburgh*, March 15, 1704, for burning the holy bible, &c. by the hands of the common hangman p. 265

POSTSCRIPT.

Shewing how the honourable houſe of commons in *England* is treated by the preſbyterians in *Scotland* p. 269

With a ſpecimen of the gravity and abilities of their miniſters and kirk-judicatories. p. 272

FINIS.

A GE-

A GENERAL

INDEX

To the SIX VOLUMES of the

REHEARSALS.

N. B. *The numeral letters denote the volume; the figures, the pages.*

ABdication, I. 14, 20. II. 127, 217. Of king *James* II. discussed, V. 253—8, 263. VI. 20.
Adam, his right by creation, I. 333, his government was sovereign, I. 339.
Advice to dissenters, and presbyterians, I. 243—6.
Ailsbury, dispute of election, I. 211.
Alcoran, some good things in it, I. 170.
Allegiance, the oath of, V. 276, 280.
Anabaptists, VI. 11—19.
St. *Andrew*'s, arch-bishop, his murder ridiculed, I. 4.
Angels, The angels in heaven are reconciled by *Christ*, V. 159.
Apocrypha, Why we reject the books of *Apocrypha* from the canon of holy scriptures, V. 25.
Arbitrary, What it is, and in whom, V. 276.
Army, Abused by *Observator*, III. 198, 200. Of a standing army, II. 18. III. 201.
Articles 39, Cleared as to predestination, IV. 40.

Asgil.

Asgil John, His book, that the faithful cannot die, III. 244, 248, 293, 295, 303, 309.

Ash——t Sir *W*. The mistake for Sir *H—ry* corrected, I. 262, 263; further cleared, and set in a true light, I. 271, 292.

Assurance, IV. 35—8, wherein lies the assurance of Christians, V. 144.

Author, Why the author of these papers undertook this task, I. 303, 319. III. 19, 181, 212, 301, 302. Answer to the objection that it was on a mercenary account, II. 159. Why he conceals his name, II. 130. Lies and abuses of him, II. 147, 181, 215. III. 204.

B.

Baptism, Of baptizing for the dead, III. 314. More culpable as administer'd among the dissenters, than if performed by a porter or midwife in case of necessity, IV. 115. The baptism of our dissenting preachers is not only null but sacrilege. At best utterly uncertain. And ours most certain according to their own confession, IV. 116. The danger in being baptized by them, IV. 126. The groundless assertion that King *Charles* was baptized by a presbyterian, IV. 222, 226. How little made of it by the presbyterians, V. 296, 310. VI. 6. Their baptisms are invalid, V. 315—8. VI. 3—7, 29, 30, 34. Of rebaptization, VI. 5, 34. The necessity of it, VI. 7. Infant-baptism. See Anabaptists.

Barons, The barons wars fatal to *England*, V. 175.

Barons, The patriot-barons gave three counties to the *Scots*, and all *England* to the *Dauphin* of *France*, V. 238. The presbyterian-barons copy'd after them, V. 239.

Bartholomew-fair. The charge of the *Observator* against the governors of St. *Bartholomew*'s hospital on account of the fair, V. 147—150.

Bicl-

Beelzebub, The God of flies, resembles vox populi, II. 13. III. 235.
Belial, signifies liberty. Whence sons of *Belial*, I. 188. III. 235. *Belial* and *Beelzebub*, these names shew the original of rebellion, and contain all the pretences for it, IV. 286.
Bigger William, His story, V. 281, 286.
Bishops insulted, VI. 41.
Brook, lord, remarkable death, I. 184.
Bryan, A presbyterian preacher in *Staffordshire*, his method of conversion, II. 311—4.
Bullying, I. 127, 132.
Burgess Dan. His stars, I. 112. Excuse for him, II. 144.

C.

Call, The call of the people to the ministry, or from the holiness of the person, first set up by *Korah*, IV. 137. The call of God to the priesthood is outward and visible, IV. 138.
Calves-head clubs, I. 176, 183.
Cambridge oration, II. 140.
Cameronians, (see covenant) are the truest presbyterians, owned by them as saints and martyrs, as in the monument lately erected for them in *Grey Friers* churchyard, at *Edinburgh*; yet, upon turns, the other presbyterians call them mad-men, and lay all their treasons and rebellions upon them, V. 105—7. But the presbyterians were always the same: it was before they were called *Cameronians*, that they solicited the king and queen of *Bohemia* to usurp upon their father and their brother, V. 107. K. *Charles* I. bade us forgive them, but never trust them, V. 112, 125. How the act of oblivion clears them, V. 123, 124. Some of them started at their own wickedness, V. 124. They sold and murdered K. *Charles* I. V. 129, 130.
Camisar prophets, IV. 181, 234.
Case of the *Regale*, I. 196, 411.

Cassandra,

Cassandra, I. 1, 9.
Ceremonies, Necessary, significant the best. The presbyterians use baptism only as a ceremony, V. 315—8.
Charity, See unity of the church.
K. *Charles* I. his murder vindicated and ridiculed, I. 11, 17. II. 82, 119. The visible cause of his ruin, II. 10.
K. *Charles* II. cleared from persecution, II. 244, 245, 283. III. 65.
Church, Not a sect only, but a society, I. 106. How the sacred and civil powers came to interfere, IV. 227. How the church is the pillar and ground of the truth, IV. 232, 233. Errors in doctrine always follow the invasion of the authority of the church, IV. 333: She ought to maintain her dignity, IV. 236. The church is no judge of faith or of any article of the *Creed*. Begin with the first article: Who is judge whether there is a God or not? Whether there is a *Christ*? or Holy Ghost? Whether there be a resurrection, or a future judgment? &c. V. 16. The church is the best interpreter of scripture, V. 14. We receive all the *Creed* (except the first article) from the evidence, not the authority of the church, V. 17, 18. This evidence is infallible, yet not the church, V. 18. How the church is the pillar and ground of the truth, V. 18. What authority the church has, and in what, V. 19. No salvation (in the ordinary way) out of the church, ibid. The power of forgiving sins is given to men, V. 20.
Church of *England*, insulted and attacked. Last squeak, I. 220. Past twelve o'clock, I. 249. Whigs and dissenters proclaim her danger, II. 76, 80, 90, 96, (*Calamy*'s *Register*) II. 99. (*De Foe*'s proverbial jest) II. 115, 143. (her *Epitaph*) II. 149, 238, (bantered) II. 252. Some give her no foundation but the laws of the land, III. 184. Made most vile, and so represented to foreign countries, VI. 43.
Church-censures, in remitting and retaining sins, are judicial, and not only declaratory, III. 95, 100, 102.

Church-

Church-party, Their management compared with that of the whigs, I. 13. Idolatry does not un-church, II. 209. Security to the church in ſtanding to her principles, III. 75. State of the church exemplified, with two books to be anſwered, I. 3—5.

Clergy, Attacked, II. 140, 193, 198, 253, 308. III. 18. Some of the *Engliſh* clergy againſt the church, III. 324. IV. 23. What part they had in the revolution, IV. 276. 279. To be changed, VI. 38. How repreſented, VI. 40.

Cobler of *Glouceſter*, I. 135.

Coercion, None againſt the king, I. 3, 14, 176. II. 37, 339, 354, 356, 367, 368. III. 6, 17, 38, 47, 49, 60. No enacting it, V. 72. *Bracton* againſt it, V. 171. Charter of K. *John* V. 175. A wonderful thing to have coercion preached publickly from preſs and pulpit, V. 189. Coercion is only ſcaffolding, V. 192. No co-ordinate power in government, V. 59, 82, 96. The laws againſt coercion are ſo plain, that we need conſult no lawyers in the caſe. The ſtatute 12 *Car*. II. c. 30, againſt coercion, approved lately as good law in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, V. 225. No law in *England* ſo ſolemnly approved as this, V. 226. It was a trick put upon the *Obſervator*, to make him inſiſt upon this ſtatute, V. 227. This ſtatute cannot be repealed, V. 227, 271, 272. None for coercion but uſurpers, V. 248—51.

Communion, No terms of communion in the church of *England* but the *Apoſtles-Creed*, I. 124. The caſe of ſinful conditions impoſed, III. 103.

Commonwealths, The firſt beginning of them; the miſeries that enſued; uncapable of mercy; deſtroying their deliverers, II. 23—26, 36, 217, 224.

Comprehenſion, IV. 9.

C——r Mr. inſulted, II. 248.

Conqueſt, Gives no right, III. 4, 14.

Conſcience, The caſe of an erring conſcience, III. 104, 107, 135. IV. 90—3. Liberty of conſcience allowed to all but to the king, V. 80.

Conſti-

Constitution, What it is, II. 339, 354, 355. See government.

Convention, Why they went upon abdication, and not upon coercion, V. 252.

Co-ordinate power, See government.

Coronation oath explained, V. 272.

Corporation and *test acts*, I. 25.

Crown, Our allegiance is only to the crown, and the power of the sword only in the crown; and there is no treason but against the crown, V. 96; nor is there any civil authority but what is derived from the crown, V. 119.

Covenant, Covenanters put themselves under the protection of the *French* king, and craved his aid against K. *Charles* I. II. 101: The presbyterian solemn league and covenant is transcribed from the popish holy league in *France*, V. 140: The *Scotch* covenanters transferred their allegiance to the *French* king, V. 141: A covenanter drawn in miniature by the *Review*, V. 147: What a covenant parliament did, ibid. They think burning the covenant more heinous than buring the body of *Christ*, V. 167.

Curiosity, III. 273.

Coward Doctor, His *Second Thoughts*, III. 250, 254, 258, 260, 264—7.

D.

David, Not chosen by the people, II. 67.

Decency, To be observed in the worship of God: The monstrous indecency among the dissenters, V. 166, 168.

Declaration, The short declaration answered before, now objected anew, V. 224, 270.

De Foe, Enemy to the church, II. 189—95, 250, 255, 284: Dedication of his satyr, II. 288: He gives up *Lock*, *Sidney*, &c. II. 358: His dry and wet martyrdom, II. 82, 369.

Deists,

Deists, Their utmost hopes, III. 275: Their hardened state, III. 278.
De Laun's book, II. 238.
Deliverers, Have proved the greatest oppressors: As *Lewis* of *France* whom the barons brought over to deliver them from king *John*; but *Lewis* hated the *English* for it, and designed to extirpate them, V. 242.
Deposing-power, Abjured as impious, heretical, and damnable, V. 280, 281: The present state of it with the papists and dissenters, II. 105.
Deut. xvii. Further explained, V. 258, 259, 263.
Dilks Admiral, See false stories.
Dingley Sir *John*, His paper, V. 108.
Dispensing-power, V. 276, 277.
Dissenters, Rail at the papists, but hug their doctrines, I. 4: Their method towards peace and union, I. 90—6: In answering books, I. 99: They are the aggressors, I. 109: And fiercer since the toleration than before, I. 109: Their thanks for the toleration, I. 189: They are the cat's foot to the papists, I. 247: They canonize saints and then drop them, I. 184: They are confederate with whigs, deists, *&c.* I. 251, 271: They attack the *Creed*, I. 199. III. 150: They are un-churched by their own arguments, II. 202: They un-church the foreign reformed churches, II. 208: They stand upon a different foot from all the reformed churches abroad, II. 203; and from the kirk in *Scotland*, III. 155: Worse than the *Scots* presbyterians, III. 157: They are anathematized by *Calvin*, and reckoned mad-men by *Beza*, II. 88. III. 178: They are disowned by *Geneva* now, III. 151, 177: Their whole cause is decided, and all their pretences answered, I. 21: A computation of their numbers, III. 66—9: Of their advancing money upon the funds, II. 248. III. 67: Their case the same with that of *Korah*, *Diotrephes*, and the false apostles, IV. 84: My speaking so freely to them is out of the greatest good-will to them, IV. 112:

112: And my indispensible duty, IV. 128, 135: Their separation is causeless, and upon the greatest uncertainty, themselves being judges, IV. 113: Their ordinations are not only invalid, but sacrilegious, IV. 115, and throws them out of the church, IV. 114: Serious advice to them, IV. 125, 138: No friends to instituted religion, and give great occasion to the prophaneness of the age, V. 159: The way of their worship; see decency: God above all law, V. 281, 288.

Dodwell, Wrongfully charged as to the actual mortality of the soul: The wit of making this to be *Jacobitism*, IV. 261: Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Milton*, and Mr. *Herring*, have asserted the same as Mr. *Dodwell*; yet why all the storm is fallen upon Mr. *Dodwell*, IV. 265—8.

Dominion and *property*, Which first, II. 300, 303, 315.

Drubbing, III. 190, 191, 194, 195, 203, 222, 224.

Duels, How to be remedied, III. 194.

Durham, The bishop, dean, and chapter vindicated, from a false and malicious story of the *Review*, VI. 35—8, 39, 41, 49.

E.

Edinburgh, The horrid cavalcade there, I. 176, 190—5, II. 118.

Edward the confessor was an usurper, and left the crown to a foreigner from the lawful heir, upon whose father he had usurped, V. 245: His laws are no laws to us, V. 212, 215.

Edwards Dr. IV. 23, 27, 34, 41, 45, 47, 49, 58, 61.

Election and *Reprobation*, IV. 27, 30.

Elections for *Parliament*, I. 120, 211, 214, 237, in *Suffolk*, *Oxford*, &c. The different appearances there: How the papists and quakers went, I. 270—5, 280: Election at *Chester* and *Exeter*, I. 280: The dissenters cannot be for the interest of the church, V. 66: Some go constantly to church, and constantly side against

against her, V. 66: Answer to the advice to the electors in *England*, V. 88.
Emlin, The *Socinian*, his story, IV. 235:
England, Church, loves rest, V. 289.
Englishmen love to believe hard things, V. 46, 47.
Enthusiasm, IV. 35—8, described with the cure of it, V. 158, 162.
Episcopacy, Why upon the reformation it was retained in *Denmark* and *Sweden*, and not in *Holland* and the *Hans-Towns*, and by the princes in *Germany*, I. 178: A demonstration of it, IV. 113: The consequence of breaking off from it, IV. 114: The logomachy about the words bishop and presbyter, IV. 117, 240, 241: The succession of the churches only by the bishops, IV. 117: Episcopacy could not creep in by degrees, undiscovered, IV. 119: The papal supremacy was discovered, as likewise their errors in doctrine, IV. 120, 121: How far opinions may become facts, IV. 124: Episcopacy (as monarchy) the original government, and neither popery nor presbytery, IV. 122—4: As great evidence for episcopacy as for the canon of the scripture, or the articles of the *Creed*, IV. 132: It is not alterable by man, IV. 133: Bishops having more or less power is not the question, IV. 172, 173—5, 178: The primitive bishops had far more authority than ours, IV. 179: The universality of episcopacy, and the clear succession of it, IV. 175, 176: The necessity of bishops in our foreign plantations, IV. 177: Of civil titles being given to bishops, IV. 180: Of kneeling to them, and asking their blessing: This done to the *Camisars*, quakers, &c. IV. 181, 182: All the bishops since the apostles were diocesan bishops, and had a plurality of presbyters under them, and power of ordination, IV. 184, 185: The mistake of the phrase *One bishop and one altar*, IV. 185: The superiority of bishop to presbyter shewed from scripture, IV. 242: Testimonies of the most learned presbyterians to episcopacy in St. *Cyprian*'s time, IV. 243: Above the power of king, parliament, and people, V. 306.

Ex-

Experiment, New defence for it, re-printed with a new title, VI. 50, 51, 52—6, 68, 72.

F.

Faith and *Assurance*, IV. 36; and works, IV. 70: There is no judge of faith but God, V. 13—6.

False stories spread abroad, as to *Northampton*, I. 115—22, 275—8: *Suffolk*, *Ipswich*, and *Norwich*, I. 137, 40: Mr. *Lamb* at *Harpenden*, I. 259: The *Weather-cock* at *Oxford*, I. 256, 263, 277, 280, 411, II. 177, 180: *Taunton*, II. 260—4, 266, 270—7, 293: Of a priest near *Whitechapel*, II. 349, 351: Of Mr. *Langdon* and *Sorrel*, and run-away *Hill*, III. 20, 21: *Oakhampton*, III. 22, 27, 30—7: The *Emblem* sign at *Stoke* in *Suffolk*, III. 158; for which the *Observator* has made himself answerable, III. 205: Of admiral *Dilks*, III. 161—5, 166, 167, 188, 189, 196, 197, 215, 220.

Fatherhood, Its right opposed by Mr. *Lock*, I. 335, 339—43, 352, 353: How we are bound by the acts of our fathers, II. 297, 323, 338, 339.

Foreigners, Our success under them, I. 24, 27: The folly of king *Vortigern* in letting a *German* prince come over, who deposed him, V. 185: Never did well in *England*: The dauphin of *France* crowned king of *England* at *London*, anno 1216, by the rebellious barons; but he hated the traitors, though he loved the treason, would never trust them, and designed to destroy them, and bring over colonies of his own countrymen, V. 242.

Forfeitable, That word determines all controversies about government, VI. 89.

France, Method of humbling it, II. 234.

Free-born, III. 242.

Freeholders, Their tenure and right to vote examined, VI. 85—9: Their right is forfeitable, VI. 89: Of arming them, I. 143: Their right to vote, I. 146, II. 298, 375, III. 15.

Free-

Free-will, IV. 24, 28.

G.

Gag for a goose, II. 73.
Gazette London, Run down by the whigs, and why, I. 47.
George St. and the dragon, III. 239.
Gibraltar, I. 58, 61.
Gifted-men, IV. 50, 54, 55.
Glasgow arch-bishop of, a scandal upon him cleared, V. 104.
God held to be matter and body, III. 274: All his dispensations are by the hands of men, V. 20: No creature can approach him immediately: As we come to him by *Christ*, so now to *Christ* by the mediation of his priests, V. 159.
Government, The original of it, I. 2, 328, II. 39, 362—6: By divine right, I. 321—3, 326. II. 183—6, 320: By institution as well as nature, I. 334: First limitations of it, II. 21: Limitations of concession and coercion, I. 148, 188: Every government must be absolute, I. 222, 231—6: The heathen notion of government, I. 229, 327: The whig notion of it, I. 146: The *Greeks* and *Romans*, when they became *Christian*, altered their notions of government, III. 10, 219: The whigs oppose hereditary government, I. 66, 156. II. 322: Of separating the authority from the person. II 320: The whigs obliged to shew the time when there was no government in the world, II. 331: Government consists in the form and the persons who govern, II. 330: Government had been though *Adam* had not fallen, II 360: Probable that man had never thought of government if God had not appointed it, II. 303, 330: Both powers sacred and civil were originally in the same person, with the great benefit of it, II. 52: Honour as much due to governors as tribute, and as necessary, III. 216, 222: Of good and bad govern-

governors, IV. 102—4: Of baſtard-governments, IV. 119: The true ſecret of government told by *Boccalini*, IV. 166: All governments pretend to divine right, for none can ſtand without it, IV. 297: The men of the Rights make the government of God himſelf to be jure humano, IV. 297: There muſt be an ultimate judge in all government, V. 38: All government equally arbitrary, V. 40: There is no middle ſtate betwixt abſolute power and lawleſs confuſion, V. 40, 41: The diſturbers of government carried by imagination, not by reaſon, V. 42, 50: Mr. *Hoadly* brings the people's rejecting God from being their king, as a proof that the people are the beſt judges of government, V. 43, 56: The plea that reſiſtance ought to be only in plain caſes, V. 45: The example of *Moſes* anſwers all pleas for reſiſtance, V. 49: What our conſtitution is, V. 59, 72, 115: God did appoint a particular form of government, V. 60, 63: The whigs take their notions of government from the heathens, before their converſion to Chriſtianity, but not afterwards, V. 62: There never was any popular government truly ſo, V. 64: No appeal to the people, V. 71: Conditions betwixt ſovereigns and ſubjects, leaves all ſtill in the ſovereign, V. 71: A rule in comparing of governments, V. 76: Differences betwixt the conſtitution and adminiſtration, V. 78, 79, 81: Authority only does determine, not law, juſtice, or reaſon, V. 119: The philoſopher's ſtone in government, the whigs are finding it out, V. 193.

Grace, The neceſſity of it, IV. 29, 45.

H.

Hanover ſucceſſion oppoſed, I. 67, 156: To be called over, I. 66, 408. II. 1, 15, 27.

Hickeringil Edmund, His recantation, III. 207—10.

High-church, The diſtinction of high and low-church ſet up by the whigs: They make them worſe than the papiſts: By high-church they mean the whole church of *England*, II. 124. They

They have discarded the low-church, II. 133: No low-church in heaven, ibid.

High-fliers, How they are traitors and perjured, and yet not the whigs or dissenters, for the same thing, IV. 277: One may justly equivocate, but not the other, IV. 278: How the high-fliers ruined K. *James* II. IV. 279, and cut off the head of K. *Charles* I. IV. 282: Therefore that Q. *Anne* should not trust them, nor encourage passive-obedience which did all these things, IV. 282.

Hoadly Mr. *John*, IV. 67, 68, 71, 72, 73—77, 78—107. Mr. *Ben*. V. 37—48, 51, 53, 56, 58, 59, 61—65, 82—9, 92, 100—2, 229. See government.

Honiton-fray, I. 241.

Honour, A pretty notion of it, III. 220.

Hooker Mr. His authority waved as to government, V. 118.

Husband, Mr. *Lock* founds his authority on contract, I. 353: Makes the wife have equal power over the children, I. 335.

I.

James, K. *James* II. The chief cause of his ruin, verses found in his slipper, I. 247: The only reign of all before him since the reformation that *De Foe* clears from persecution, I. 69: He makes him a greater martyr than his father, 82, 369: The foolish argument that he had no right to succeed to the crown because of his religion: The confession of faith is against excluding a king for his religion, V. 8, 9: His abdication, V. 253—7.

January 30, How observed by the dissenters: The psalm they sung that day, I. 176—9, 202: Why they would have it laid aside, II. 122: They make it idolatry, II. 123: A mark of loyalty, II. 293: Proclamation made the *Sunday* before, I. 176.

Jeroboam guilty of rebellion, II. 68: How his rebellion was said to be from the Lord, V. 56, 57: The prophecy of *Ahijah* no warrant to his rebellion, more than the prophecy that was of *Absalom*, or to *David* to kill *Saul*: The ten tribes were in the rebellion of *Absalom* and of *Sheba*: The two tribes remained loyal in all the three rebellions, and restored K. *David*, V. 201, 202.

Jesus, Why we bow at this name rather than at the name of God or of Christ, V. 163—5.

Infallibility, To believe the infallibility of the church, supposes my self infallible, V. 22.

Intruders into churches, how meant in *Scotland*, V. 282.

Judge, The judgment of discretion and authority, V. 16, 24: In the first sense every man is judge of every thing: In the latter sense it is blasphemy to say, there is any judge of faith but God; see faith: Who shall be judge? Only to be asked in smaller matters, V. 16: It gives no certainty, V. 22: It is not to be asked in matters of faith or of opinion: But in government it is necessary, V. 38: If king and parliament be not judge of law, then cobler and tinker must, V. 228: Mr. *Hoadly* is for the latter, V. 229.

Judges, All accused by *Observator*, I. 17, 136.

Issachar, V. 289.

K.

King, Good kings made worse than bad ones, II. 54, 225: They say no king ever was deposed, II. 119: Even incapacity in a king takes not away his right, I. 149: Of kings being called sacred, II. 295: Less danger from the king than from the people, III. 51. IV. 102: The change of kings never worth a rebellion, III. 234, 237: Whence kings are called fathers of their country, IV. 107: Kings and bishops always go together, IV. 221: King and kirk are the lion and the cock, IV. 227: The king only has no liberty of conscience, is not free-born, or has any inheritance,

heritance, V. 180: The pope's claim and the people's claim over kings, V. 186: See crown, the king can do no wrong, how to be underſtood, V. 223: The law did not make the king, V. 223, 224.
Kit Kat, Their theatre and dedication, I. 251.

L.

Ladies-necklaces, I. 53.
Lambard, Is no act of parliament, or pleadable in *Weſtminſter-hall*, V. 212: His authority, and of his new *Saxon* laws, V. 173, 186: Grounded on the pope's univerſal ſupremacy, V. 177: He ſays nothing of coercion when rightly underſtood: He aſſerts the king to be the vice-gerent of God, and thence to have authority to govern the people: The *Obſervator* leaves out material words of his, V. 186, 187: According to *Lambard*, that king who did not hang the *Obſervator* and all the whigs did not deſerve the name of a king, V. 188.
Lambert Dr. His ſermon, *October* 23, 1708, V. 275, 276.
Laud arch-biſhop, inſulted, I. 4: Vindicated, IV. 41.
Lauder, His anſwer to Dr. *Maurice*, IV. 245: How the *Review* got off from his promiſe of lending it me, very ingeniouſly, IV. 303: The true reaſon of it, IV. 306.
Law, Bars all coercion over the king, I. 11, 16, 176. II. 37: Not above the king, II. 377. III. 4: All laws are reſtraints upon liberty: To reign is to reſtrain, II. 60: Law ſtill on the ſtrongeſt ſide, V. 98: How the laws cut off the king's head, V. 189: The diſſenters ſay the laws muſt not be executed againſt them, but to the rigour againſt the epiſcopal, V. 281: Not according to the letter, but the pleaſure of thoſe in power, V. 288: The law is the ſtandard of liberty and property, VI. 21.

Lay-deprivation allowed by the *Scotiſh* kirk, condemned by the houſe of lords in *England*, II. 158, 202.
Le Clerc, VI. 43.
Legion, I. 21—9.
Liberty, I. 188, 388, 390, 399. II. 131. III. 221, 235: Contrary to law, is anarchy and confuſion, VI. 22: What a fool is made of it, VI. 81, 97: More of it under monarchy than in an elective government, VI. 88, 96: It is the greateſt tyrant in the world, VI. 98.
Limitations, Limitations of conceſſion, but not of coercion, are conſiſtent with ſupremacy, V. 93.
L'Eſtrange Sir *Roger* vindicated, V. 169.
Lock John, Anſwer to his two treatiſes of government, I. 231—6, 239, 332—7, 352—380.
London-fire, By whom it was done moſt probably, I. 30—8.
Loyalty, I. 8: A mark of it, II. 293.
Lucifer, His rebellion not againſt God immediately, I. 329.
Lutherans, Much the ſame with the papiſts as to doctrine: The preſbyterian *Lutherans* farther from us than the epiſcopal, V. 185.
Lying, The advantage of it, I. 26, 45.

M.

Memorial of the church of *England*, wrote by ſome whig, II. 166—170.
Militia, Taken from the crown, I. 144—6. III. 202.
Miniſtry, Struck at by the whigs, I. 11, 16, 22. II. 173: Particularly two great men, and one great woman, I. 11, 16, 22, 41, 47, 52. II. 114, 128, 220, 222, 223, 226—233, 258, 259, 277—280. III. 197, 199.
Moderation, I. 114, 128, 152: (Aſſembly of divines) I. 220. II. 96: (The ſtory of *Peter*) I. 276: A general

general maſſacre) I. 357: (Brimſton) II. 194. III. 160: (Made a jeſt of) II. 144: (Her death and burial) II. 112: Now upon the union, IV. 26: Our moderation men more knaves than fools, V. 125: The hiſtory of it from St. *Peter* to K. *Charles* I. VI. 46.

Monarchy, The original government, II. 20: Moſt agreeable to the law of nature, I. 352: Of elective and mixt monarchy, II. 36, 138: Univerſal monarchy aboliſhed, I. 412. II. 365: The whigs make monarchy an heatheniſh invention, III. 7; The *Iſraelites* were not againſt it; but they would not have God to be their king, V. 43: The manner of a king, 1 *Sam.* viii. makes not againſt monarchy, V. 44: The beſt kings worſt uſed: People have oppreſſors of their own making, V. 51, 55: Monarchy was the golden age: And is moſt for the ſecurity of the people, V. 64, 65, 80, 82: All government reſults into monarchy, V. 95: People may not chuſe their kings as they do their wives, V. 116, 117.

Muſcovy, Better there than in *Poland*, VI. 88: The whig-inſult upon the *Muſcovite* ambaſſador, VI. 76.

N.

Narva, The *Engliſh* factory there were prohibited from having any of our diſſenters for their chaplain, becauſe of their rebellious principles, VI. 47.

Nations, The original of them, and how divided, I. 382, 394.

Nature, The original ſtate of it, I. 332: The law of nature as to government, I. 352. III. 9: The whigs ſtate of nature ſeen in *Holborn*, III. 239: The true ſtate of nature, II. 290, 326. III. 9. IV. 108—110: The law of nature truly ſtated, IV. 291: It is againſt rebellion for monarchy and paſſive-obedience, IV. 292.

Necessity, Excuses not laymen to encroach on any part of the priestly office, IV. 151: Though it may as to some privileges of the clergy, as *David* to eat the shew bread, IV. 131.

New test of the church of *England*'s loyalty, I. 114. II. 84.

Noah had sovereign power, I. 381.

Non-conformists, Difference between them and dissenters, with an ear-mark for a non-con, II. 92, 95.

O.

Oaths, The privilege of whigs in taking oaths, that is not allowed to churchmen, IV. 278: The obligation of oaths, and of unlawful oaths, V. 7: If oaths are supposed to be taken hypocritically, dissolves government, and takes away their greatest security, and is a foul reflection upon the revolution, V. 136: The notable dexterity of playing with oaths shewed in the saints of the last grass, V. 138.

Observator, His post, I. 5, 8: Turns match-maker, I. 65: His religion, I. 82: His church, I. 96: His merits, I. 132: His trial, I. 83, 89: His moderation, I. 152: His being metamorphosed at last into cuckow, I. 307: And drubbed for *John Tutchin*, because he could not change his note, III. 190: His receipt for wit and repartees, III. 172: His conversion, III. 182: His pumpion, III. 196: His education and conversation, III. 211: His picture, III. 224: His raree-shew, III. 143: He affronts the inferior clergy, V. 170: He asserts coercion over the crown; see coercion: The statute 12 *Car.* II. c. 30, vindicated against him, V. 174: He quotes a charter against an act of parliament: He gives the pope the dominion over *England*, and calls it an honest simplicity, V. 177: He falls into rank treason, and makes the queen a tyrant and an usurper, V. 182: And to be destroyed like her grand-

grandfather, V. 189: He can ſhew no original contract of our firſt *Saxon* kings, which he aſſerts from *Lambard:* It is plain *Lambard* ſpoke not of them, V. 186: He falſely charges king *Charles* I. for making war upon the parliament: It is plain they began the war, V. 191: He aſperſes the revolution with aſſerting coercion over tyrants, V. 191, 192: He would hang himſelf if he were a king, V. 192: He writes in concert with the *Rehearſal*, V. 125, 200: He puts the revolution on the ſame foot with the rebellion of the ten tribes, V. 200, 201, 204: He repeats ſlanders from the time of K. *James* I. V. 210: He juſtifies the aſſaſſination-plot, as being purſuant to his principles of coercion, V. 213: He produces a challenge of his to me of the 17th *Auguſt* laſt, which I had anſwered the 12th of *June* before; and now he refuſes to meet me upon it, V. 222: He falls directly upon the queen by name, and accuſes her of no leſs than treaſon: Her majeſty vindicated by the declaration of the late prince of *Orange*, V. 235: He denies her majeſty's right by inheritance, which was recognized in ſo many addreſſes, ibid. He owns himſelf a traitor, and the queen an uſurper, if ſhe will not allow of coercion over herſelf, V. 236, 237: He ſays that king *William*, queen *Mary*, and queen *Anne*, joined with pope *Innocent* to depoſe their father, V. 240: He cannot avoid a trap more than his predeceſſor, V. 241: He loves a popiſh ſaint if he be but a rebel or an uſurper, V. 245: He ſtabs the revolution to the heart, and owns it to be contrary to all our laws, V. 247: His bare-faced modeſty! in ſaying he had quoted acts of parliament for coercion, ibid. He denies the authority of *Weſtminſter-hall*, and of all the lawyers in *England*, as to the point of government, and the right of kings; yet we are ſent to lawyers to ſettle our conſcience as to this very point, V. 214: He quotes none but uſurpers for coercion, V. 248, 250: He has been drawn into treaſon, V.

252: He brings instances for rebellion, and the power of the people, which confounds them both, V. 260, 261: He brings proofs directly against himself, V. 264: He complains to lords and commons, and threatens the queen and the revolution to hang them all, if I will not allow him to get the better as to coercion, V. 266—73: His puss runs away with him, and is hanged, V. 274: He says the law must not be put in execution against a presbyterian, V. 281: He arraigns the nation of *Scotland* as traitors, V. 303: He would have all the episcopal people of *Scotland* to be hanged, V. 305: He falls upon the ministry, VI. 19, 31, 58: He justifies his stirring up persecution against me instead of argument, VI. 30, 56, 58: He arraigns the queen and the ministry for fools or *Jacobites*, and encourages the pretender, VI. 58, 59: A charm to secure him, but it will not fit him, ibid.

Occasional conformity, I. 23, 218. See moderation.

Oliver, All *Olivers* the same, V. 192.

Oral tradition, III. 356.

Orange, A civil-war raised against me for wishing well to the new prince of *Orange*, IV. 248, 249: The *Review* his satyr upon the late prince of *Orange*, IV. 255: Prince and princess of *Orange* vilely reproached by the *Observator*, V. 126.

Ordination, The succession of it in the church of *England*, but not among the presbyterians, VI, 64—7.

P.

Park-keeper and *deer-stealer*, I. 386—93, 404—6.

Parliament legioned, Called a pack of hounds, and mad-dogs by *Observator*, who bids them kiss his a—— I. 242, 308: He charges them with the loss of *Newfoundland*, our trade, our liberties, *&c.* They are threatened with the magazine of original power, I. 298,

298, 299: And made accountable to the people, I. 304: *Harrington* ſays they are of the compoſition of gunpowder, I. 300: *T. R.* makes a parliament of the Trinity, I. 225: And *Tutchin* makes eſtate, liberty, and life, a trinity that is worſhipped on earth, ibid. And *Baxter* makes heaven a parliament, I. 184: All our parliaments condemned and ſent to *Tophet* by the *Review*, IV. 292: They are accuſed by him for the murder of king *Charles* I. and the betraying of king *James* II. IV. 295, 296: No parliament ever enacted the principles of reſiſtance, IV. 297: A parliament voting itſelf to be the next parliament: And one parliament choſen by another, and not by the people, V. 65, 72, 89: A teſt to diſcover the ſpies in parliament, V. 75: The honeſt muſt take courage, or we're all undone, V. 75, 76: The legiſlature is not divided between king and parliament, the ſluice and the mill: Not proper to ſay the king has a negative, V. 93, 94, 122: The whigs put all in the *Commons* without king or lords, V. 120: The antient and modern ſtyle of acts of parliament, V. 121: Every thing called a parliament is not a parliament, V. 98, 197: Parliament not co-ordinate with the king, V. 222.

Paſſing-bell, The abuſe of it to be reformed, *Preface*, V. 1.

Paſſive-obedience, Called an unnatural doctrine, IV. 99, 102: Dictated by the law of nature, IV. 289: Acts of parliament fail, IV. 294: And our homilies, IV. 295.

Patriarchat, Deſtroys popular government, II. 363, 364.

Patriots, A true deſcription of them exemplified in king *John* and the barons, V. 242—4.

Paul, (St.) Vindicated againſt Mr. *Hoadly*, V. 82—7.

Peace, What peace we ought to endeavour, and what will be laſting, V. 76.

Pearſon Mr. *John*, His caſe before the kirk-judicatories, V. 308—10.

People, No certain meaning of that word: Every party applies it to themſelves: No full repreſentation ever made, or poſſible to be made of the people, without ſuppoſing that a part is more than the whole, which *De Foe* in terms aſſerts, I. 146, 154: Reſolving all power into the people is a popiſh doctrine, ſhewed from the lord biſhop of *Sarum*, who thinks it better in the pope than in the people, II. 106: It carries in its conſequences the ſetting ourſelves above God, and making him dependent upon us, I. 355: Since fully juſtified by the *Rights*, III. 112, 125 Of the pretended power of the people to chuſe their paſtors and their kings, I. 185—9: People chuſe their king as they are ſaid to chuſe their God, II. 65: Mr. *Lock* makes nonſenſe of the power of the people, I. 358—64: The people cannot govern, III. 221, 232, 242: They are made head of the church, III. 186: What they are, III. 237, 241: They are always loſers by rebellion, III. 232, 237: How they are free-born, III. 242: They cannot derive their authority from any, nor can any derive authority from them, V. 120: *Deut.* xvii. and 1 *Sam.* viii. cleared from giving them any authority to chuſe their king, V. 197: The *Obſervator*'s authority from the heathen, and from the council of *Baſil*, for the power of the people make both directly againſt him, V. 232—4. See government and monarchy.

Pharaoh, The caſe of *Pharaoh* and the *Iſraelites*: Why the *Iſrael-Jacobites* did not return when *Pharaoh* purſued them? as the *Review* aſks: The *Iſraelites* juſtified from cheating in borrowing the jewels of the *Ægyptians*, IV. 308—10.

Philip Levi, the *Jew*, His remarkable ſtory, I. 254.

Philoſophy and *Reaſon*, III. 252.

Play-houſe, Played againſt the church, II. 250: Mr. *Collier* bantered for writing againſt the ſtage, II. 255.

Poets

Poets of the ſtage, III. 272.
Poland. An inſtructive example to us at this day, III. 236: Their liberty and property, VI. 21.
Popery is *Eraſtian*, III. 79: The univerſal ſupremacy of the pope againſt both fact and reaſon, III, 84: The grand queſtion, Who ſhall be judge in matters of faith? V. 13, 22: The church of *Rome* is guilty of blaſphemy, if ſhe pretends to be judge in matters of faith, V. 16, 24: Which ſhe once did, V. 29: It would make her more infallible than the apoſtles or angels of heaven, and ſhe may give us a new goſpel at this rate, V. 21: She undermines the faith by it, V. 22: And gives no certainty at all, ibid. The infallibility of general councils are of little uſe to the people, unleſs every confeſſor and pariſh-prieſt be infallible, V. 30: They agree not what is faith, and have changed in it, V. 31: They not only explain, but make new articles of faith, V. 30: They are neither the univerſal, nor the mother-church; nor is there any promiſe to her in the *New Teſtament*, V. 34—6.
Pope's, The ſupremacy, is very ſick, V. 157.
Popes, Have helped ſons to depoſe their godly fathers, V. 179: They have been the great factors of rebellion even down to our times, V. 183.
Poſſeſſion, When that gives right, I. 416. II. 36, 361, 366, 384. III. 4, 14.
Prayer, Extempore, I. 39: The preſbyterians are uncovered, and ſometimes kneel at their family-prayers, but will not in the church: Their brutal familiarity with God, their blunders, and even blaſphemy in their publick prayers: The extempore way firſt ſet up by popiſh emiſſaries, V. 167, 168, 208.
Preaching, Of the church and diſſenters, II. 117, 244.
Precedents, Arguments from them, III. 40, 46, 61.
Predeſtination, IV. 24—48, 68.
Prerogative, The greateſt ſecurity to the people, III. 51.

Presbyterians, How inconsiderable a part of the Christian church, IV. 131: Their case parallel to that of *Korah*, IV. 136: The first presbyterian church was in the year 1541, IV. 149: None can shew any before, though several have attempted it, IV. 171: Lex talionis to them among us, IV. 199—201: They are for lay-coronations, IV. 126: Their confession of faith is against excluding papists from the throne, V. 9: They now persecute episcopacy in *Scotland*, deny the call of the people, and set up *Erastianism*, which at the same time they abjure, V. 282: They now begin in the same method they did with king *Charles* I. and are never, to be contented, V. 287: Their persecution now in *Scotland*, V. 290—6: Their behaviour in the reign of king *Charles* II. V. 300: And to queen *Anne*, ibid. They propose to have a *Scotch* presbyterian meeting-house set up in *London*, V. 301: Neither their toleration in *England*, nor establishment in *Scotland*, takes away their schism, V. 306: The intolerable proceedings of the kirk-judicatories in *Scotland* against the clergy, V. 307—12: They make nothing of baptism, their baptisms are invalid, V. 315—8. VI. 3—6, 29, 34: Their strictness as to the *Sabbath*, is a confirmation of the authority of the church, against which they set up, VI. 14, 15: They stand upon a different foot from the reformed abroad, and all churches in the world, VI. 29: How treated in *Sweden*, especially the *Scotch*, VI. 47: Their libel against Mr. *Hedderweik*; and how they treated a lady of quality when she was dying, VI. 60—4: Instance of presbyterian ordination from *Bede* of *Columba*, VI. 65.

Presbytery, Never introduced at first but by rebellion, III. 63: And by *Erastianism*, III. 78: They never prevailed so much against *Erastianism* as the episcopal church in *Scotland*, III. 77.

Pressing, How reconciled with liberty, VI. 74, 78, 81.

Priest and *Prince* are synonymous terms, IV. 227.

Prieſt-craft, I. 110: Strolling preachers, ibid. Tickets for ſermons, ibid.

Prieſthood, The neceſſity of it, I. 173. III. 99: Its great dignity, II. 49, 346—9: The contempt of it, II. 193, 344, 348: *Chriſt* a king over all, but a prieſt only to believers, II. 347: The plea of neceſſity for uſurping upon it, IV. 97: The conſecration to it muſt be outward, IV. 139: It cannot be given by the people, IV. 140: It was firſt brought into contempt by a king ſet up by the people, IV. 141: It was ordained for men, but not by men, ibid. The ſucceſſion of the Chriſtian prieſthood more certain than that of the *Levitical*, and greater ſin in deſpiſing it, IV. 142, 143, 228—31: The prieſthood of *Chriſt* is delegated to his prieſts upon earth, and we are conducted to heaven, as well by the power of the keys as by preaching: Who deny the prieſthood on earth, deny the prieſthood of *Chriſt* in heaven; and will have him for their judge to condemn them, but not for their prieſt to ſave them, V. 144—6, 155, 160.

Primogeniture, I. 342, 345—51, 352, 358—73.

Prince George abuſed, I. 18, 47.

Proclamations, Of queen *Elizabeth* againſt defamatory libels upon the church, II. 97: For reſtoring king *Charles* II. II. 295: Baniſhing proclamation in *Scotland*, II. 150.

Property, As much ſecured in monarchies as in commwealths, I. 364.

Proteſtants, Mean not always the church of *England*, V. 288.

Puritans, The ſpawn of the jeſuits; inſtrumental in the *Spaniſh* invaſion; how managed by queen *Elizabeth*, I. 97. III. 100.

Q.

Queen, Attacked, I. 17, 42, 66. II. 131. III. 64: Made a bishop, III. 136: Of her being head of the church, III. 137—40, 142—5: (And why not queen *Anne*) III. 175, 176: Of the distinction of *in sacris* and *circa sacra*: And as to the external polity of the church, III. 225—9: Church and state are independent of each other, III. 229: I defend her from the *Review*, which denies her title to the crown, VI. 100.

R.

Railing, and giving *ill-names*, I. 2. III. 203. 211, 215.

Rebellion, The beginning, with the mischiefs of it, I. 329. II. 13: The great sin of it, III. 54, 63: Easy to be kown, III. 58: The whigs make it the inspiration of God, I. 154. II. 137: The Witchcraft of it even from a natural cause, that the people must be losers by it, III. 231, 235: The hardened state of rebels, II. 140, 170. III. 238: All rebellion is for power, IV. 165: God never did approve of it, IV. 288: The custom of nations considered as to this, IV. 290: And the law of nature, IV. 292: The climax of it, V. 124: It is beyond folly, it is a judicial infatuation, and more in us than in any other people, it is rarely repented of, V. 194, 195: Beware of the third time, V. 205.

Redemption universal, IV. 43.

Reformed churches abroad that are not episcopal, yet not anti-episcopal, IV. 130: Though necessity should excuse them it would not our dissenters, IV. 131.

Regale,

Regale, The case of the *Regale* cleared from popery, V. 157: Is wrote against popery, VI. 27.

Rehearsal rehearsed, II. 373. III. 11, 15, 45: His shooting at king *James* at the *Boyne*; he is so cross he will not tell the *Review* whether he did or not; but confesses three great potentates against whom he has waged war, and will give them no quarter, IV. 282—4: Why he bullies at this rate, and what he has got by it, IV. 285, 286: What good the *Rehearsals* have done, by way of provocation to the whigs to answer, V. 195.

Rehoboam no *tyrant*, Why God would not prosper him; his son revenged his quarrel; the ten tribes guilty of rebellion, V. 1—5, 54, 55.

Religion, The support of government, III. 10.

Reprobation, IV. 27.

Resistance, The doctrine of, would unhinge the world, V. 83: The example of our Blessed Saviour against resistance, V. 86: It was set up by the puritans in queen *Elizabeth*'s time, V. 91.

Resurrection, Denied by Dr. *Coward*, III. 250, 279; see *Coward*: The same body rises, III. 253, 296: He makes one person be rewarded and suffer for another, III. 262, 279, 282.

Revelation, The necessity of it, II. 291, 327. III. 8. IV. 110.

Review, Arraigns the government, I. 210: His displeasure for my wishing well to the new prince of *Orange*, IV. 248—50: His satyr against the late prince of *Orange*, IV. 255: His *Experiment*, IV. 245—7, 271: Why he will not defend it, nor give it up, V. 10, 11: He vindicates K. *W.* from *Glencoe*, by charging the massacre in *Ireland* upon king *Charles* I. and makes the revolution blacker than the regicide, IV. 252—5, 275: He denies the authority of the queen and parliament of *Great Britain*, IV. 257: Of his submitting to church establishments, IV. 274: He accuses the church for not praying for the queen as

as head of the church, IV. 275: His revolution-church and revolution-principles, IV. 274: He allows whigs to equivocate in an oath, but not churchmen, IV. 278: His rule not to mind what is done, but by whom, IV. 279: His character of the whigs by mistake, IV. 280: The law makes sin with him, IV. 281: He says God justifies all rebellions against tyrants, IV. 287: The contrary shewed in *Pharaoh*, *Ahasuerus*, *Saul*, &c. IV. 288: He clacks like a paper-mill, ibid. He damns our laws and parliaments, makes them scarlet traitors, and sends them to *Tophet*, IV. 292: He shot at a pigeon, and hit but a crow, IV. 293: He says I'm a *Jacobite*, which exposes his method of arguing; his charge of treason laid at his own door; he is drawn in too as to the original state of nature; and now is joined in confederacy with me against the whigs, *&c.* IV. 298—302: He is wondrous pleasant at mistaking; how he proves the king to be head of the church, IV. 302—306: He makes a merry tale of the scriptures, in the instance of *Pharaoh* and the *Israelites*; he blackens the revolution in his parallel betwixt *Pharaoh* and king *James*; the *Israelites* justified from cheating the *Ægyptians* in borrowing their jewels, *&c.* IV. 309, 310: His Heathen-christian times; he calls *Rehoboam* God's own anointed tyrant, V. 1, 2: His ignorant proof that the late king *James* had no right to succeed to the crown, because of his religion; this contrary to the confession of faith, which contradicts the late acts that exclude a papist from the throne; the *Review* must be either a *Jacobite* or a blockhead, V. 8, 9: His answer to every thing, V. 12: He ridicules the holy scriptures, V. 53: He leaps at a daisie in denying the authority of king and parliament, V. 71: He makes all rebellion to be the inspiration of God, V. 83: He is convinced of the false representations he gave of the collections for the *Scots* episcopal clergy, V. 103: He proves he is not mad, and calls

West-

Weſtminſter-hall a tenement of *Satan*, V. 130: He gives our army as a donation to the devil; makes the parliament a houſe of devils, and *Satan* their ſpeaker; and ſpirits up the people to take arms againſt them, V. 131—5: Yet ſays he is a better friend to parliaments than I am, V. 135: He ſets himſelf above king and parliament and people, which is the principle of every whig, V. 137: A *Rowland* for his *Oliver*, V. 139: One word to expreſs all wickedneſs which he could not find, V. 140: He invites me again, but I bid him waſh his face firſt, V. 307: His ſtory of the prebendary of *Durham*; he inſults the biſhop, clergy, and act of uniformity, VI. 35—42: How he flinches, VI. 48, 49: Farce with him, VI. 68.

Revolution, Blackened by the whigs, and made as abominable as the 30th of *January*, I. 20. II. 82, 126, 218, 369: It did not go upon the depoſing-doctrine, or power of the people, II. 94, 103, 107, 111, 139. III. 17: The part the clergy had in it, IV. 276, 277: Of a revolution-church and revolution-principles, IV. 274: The revolution blackened by the *Review*, IV. 276, 308: Mr. *Hoadly* puts it upon the foot of reſiſtance; though never ſo good it was no cheap bargain, V. 101, 102: Revolution-principles cut both ways; a gelt-revolution, V. 127: Of a coercion-revolution, and an abdication-revolution, V. 257: The *Obſervator* makes the late revolution contrary to all our laws, V. 247.

Riga, How they treat our preſbyterians there, VI. 47.

Rights of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted, An anſwer to that book, II. 298, 345: As to government, III. 42, 79—106: The *Horeb* contract, III. 110—124: The diſſenters favour it, III. 124, 131, 133, 136, 140, 143, 146, 148: a triumph over it, III. 187: Makes God to be *jure humano*, IV. 297: And kings to be the people's anointed more than God's, V. 2: All who believe this book, are both practical and ſpe-

speculative atheists, V. 15. VI. 92, 94, *Preface*, V. 7—15, 18.

Rook Sir *George*, I. 18, 22, 41, 46, 55, 58, 91, 115: His adventure with *Colepepper*, I. 61, 71, 286.

Royal Family, Their security is in being true to one another, V. 110: This enforced upon them by king *Charles* I. V. 3.

Rye-house-conspiracy, I. 25: Denied by the whigs, II. 139.

S.

Sacrament, A true and proper sacrifice, II. 345: Figures in the institution, III. 260: Called a sacrifice in the office of communion, and by several of our divines and other learned men, V. 230: Our articles speak only of the sacrifice of the mass, V. 231: The difference betwixt that and our sacrifice, V. 231, 232.

Sacramental-test, VI. 23, 26.

Sacraments, Are not the faith, but are seals of the faith, V. 34: The *Observator* denies the holy sacrament to be the body and blood of *Christ*, V. 156, 207: By the same rule he makes void our baptism and ordination, V. 208.

Sacrifice, The same sacrifice that is offered by *Christ* in heaven, is offered by his priests on earth in the holy sacrament, V. 143, 155: This favours not transubstantiation, but utterly overthrows it, V. 162.

Sadducees, III. 312: *English Sadducees*, III. 313, 314, 317.

Saints, How some come to be saints! How one may be saint and devil both at once, V. 245.

Sandwich, The standard there, I. 265, 282, 294, 377.

Sarum, Lord bishop, against the deposing-doctrine and power of the people, he would rather have it in the pope, V. 178: He is on my side against the *Observator* and the whigs, V. 234.

Satis-

Satisfaction of *Christ*, III. 314.
Saul not chosen by the people, nor *Solomon*, II. 59, 63.
Schism, The first by *Cain* attendant on rebellion, II. 8: The new notion of it by the presbyterians in *Scotland*, II. 157.
Scotland, A summary view of the presbyterians there since the revolution, I. 138: Their overtures for security, I. 159: The ground of it, with the use intended to be made of it here, I. 142, 163—8: Persecution there, II. 87: The banishing proclamation, II. 151, 155, 161, 186: They will yield in nothing, II. 76: The *Scots* bishops and clergy vindicated as to *Erastianism*, II. 201—7: The explanatory act in *Scotland*, III. 71, 74: The rabbling of the *Scots* episcopal clergy in the year 1688: And the relief they found from convention and parliament, IV. 145: The design of hindering the collections for them, IV. 149, 187: Against the authority of the queen and the bishops, IV. 207: Motives for these collections, IV. 208—11, 218: They were not deprived on account of the oaths, nor can now be restored if they should take the oaths, unless they likewise renounce episcopacy, and conform entirely to the presbyterian church government there, IV. 152, 157, 195: What sort of martyrs the *Scots* presbyterians were in the reign of king *Charles* II. IV. 160, 161: The great lenity then shewed towards them, with the cause of the severities afterwards, 163—5, 167, 168: A vindication of the *Scots* (deprived) episcopal clergy, IV. 198, 201: The *lex talionis* the presbyterians there would draw upon themselves, IV. 199—201: They would lose their lives rather than say, God save the king, or own their bloody assassination of the arch-bishop of St. *Andrew*'s to be a murder, IV. 202: The senseless excuses of the *Observator* in these cases, IV. 203, 205, 206: Our *English* defenders of these worse than themselves, IV. 207: The different treatment of the presbyterians in *Scotland* after the restoration, from what

what the church there met with ſince the revolution, IV. 213: Books giving account of the church revolution in *Scoland*, IV. 216: How far the churches of *England* and *Scotland* are united, IV. 220—2.

Scots, Always for monarchy, and (except the preſbyterians) always loyal, V. 127, 128: A brave and loyal nation, V. 249: They ſupported the right heir of the crown of *England*, and fought for him againſt *William* the conqueror of *England* and uſurper, ibid. They were ſold by the covenant to an *Engliſh* uſurper, ibid. The perſecution of epiſcopacy there, V. 285, 289, 291. VI. 63: They are arraigned by the *Obſervator* but vindicated, V. 303, 304.

Scripture, Ridiculed and blaſphemed, II. 315, 335, 337, 342, 378. III. 91, 92, 108—11: Texts explained relating to government, *Gen.* iv. 16. (II. 8—13.) *Deut.* xvii. 14. (II. 56, 59.) xxxii. 8. (I. 395.) 1 *Sam.* viii. 9, 11. x. 25. (II. 53.) *Rom.* xiii. 1. (II. 40.) 1 *Pet.* ii. 13. (II. 20.) *Jude* 6. (I. 330.) The primitive church the ſureſt interpreter of ſcripture, III. 310: How the canon of the *New Teſtament* cannot be aſcertained without the authority of the church, V. 28.

Ship-money, VI. 83.

Shorteſt Way with the Diſſenters, I. 62. II. 82, 146.

Shooting through the head Letter, Oxon, I. 214.

Shovel Sir *Cloudeſly*, I. 56—8.

Societies, Propoſal for a ſociety of reformation of principles, III. 53.

Socinians, I. 171. IV. 72.

Solomon, Made a tyrant by the whigs, that no king might eſcape, V. 55, 199: Farther vindicated from tyranny, V. 260, 261.

Sophia, the *princeſs*, cleared from the aſperſion caſt upon her by the *Obſervator*, V. 125.

Soul, That it dies with the body, ſet up by Dr. *Coward*. See *Coward*.

Steady, The virtue of it in government, IV. 165.

Ste-

Stephens, Owned as a whig, II. 128: But upon his detection made an high-churchman, 141, 172: His letter against the D. of *M.* &c. thrown upon the high-church, II. 146: His recantation considered, II. 163.
Stuarts, Royal family vindicated, II. 282.
Succession of *Episcopacy*, There is none of presbytery, VI. 67.
Sweden, Why they give no toleration to our dissenters, VI. 47.

T.

Tacker, Character, I. 129, 216, 240.
Taxes, How due to the crown, III. 202.
Tests, IV. 12: New test to exclude churchmen, VI. 25.
Theocracy, Among the *Jews*, not a commonwealth, but an absolute monarchy, I. 397. II. 41: The hereditary and national government was then in the high-priest, II. 42: Whose majesty, revenues, guards, *&c.* are set forth, II. 48, 49: The *Jews* rejected God from being their king, and would have kings like the heathen nations, II. 56. III. 235: Toleration-act explained, IV. 56, 59.
Tradition, What sort is infallible, *Quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, V. 14.
Trojan-horse, IV. 22.
Tyranny, Whence most to be feared, III. 52: The greatest security against it, I. 313: What we have suffered by tyrants, III. 237: What tyrants might have done, II. 53. III. 237: The mildest princes generally called tyrants, and the reason of it, shewed in the case of *Zedekiah*, V. 6, 7: Divine right called divine tyranny, VI. 92, 94: More in commonwealths than in monarchies, in parliaments than in kings, VI. 96: Our very constitution (and all others) made tyranny, VI. 99: The greatest tyrant is liberty; a short

a ſhort hiſtory of it, VI. 96: How it is roaſted, VI. 97.

V.

Vox populi, I. 322. III. 13, 60, 66, 220, 295, 335.

U.

Uniformity, Act of, violently attacked, II. 78, 245: Inſulted, VI. 38.
Union, What we have been foretold of it, II. 78: Made good ſince, III. 323, 324. IV. 1—3, 8, 12, 14, 17, 19, 23, 42: Of *Capua* with *Rome*, IV. 257: Played againſt the church of *England*, V. 289. VI. 32.
Unity of the church, 1 *Cor.* xiii. IV. 49, 52.
Univerſities, Attacked, II. 80, 85.
Uſurpation, Confirms the right, V. 251.
Uſurpers, *Edward* the confeſſor, *William* the conqueror, *Henry* I. king *John*, whom the *Obſervator* quotes for coercion, V. 250: Why men will bear more from an uſurper than from their lawful king, V. 242.

W.

Weather-cock, *Oxford*, See falſe ſtories.
Whigs, Their method of buſineſs, I. 9, 26, 65, 78, 90, 115, *&c.* Their condition upon the queen's acceſſion, I. 15, 67: Their writing books to put them upon the church, I. 61. II. 145. III. 159: They have been conquered by writing, I. 221: Provocation to them to anſwer, I. 225. III. 238: Their merit towards her majeſty, II. 134. III. 60: How they are a ſupport to the crown, II. 136: What hopes of their repentance, II. 140, 170. III. 238:

238: They are the aggressors, II [illegible] whig-stories, II. 175: Whigs o[illegible] [illegible]s, II. 218: True whigs are heathens, II. 3[illegible] 337: And worse, III. 124: Whigs in authority, III. 169, 170: True description of a whig; some of them are generous and sincere, V. 69, 70: A dog in a wheel, VI. 97.

White neck, I. 24[illegible]

William, K. *Willi*[illegible] *Observator*, I. 18, 28, 299. II. 127: And by the *Review*, II. 324.

Words, A witchcraft in them, I. 228.

F I N I S.